

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 4.—OCTOBER, 1904.

I.

THE RELATIVE RELIGIOUS VALUE OF THE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.*

BY PROFESSOR WM. J. HINKE, A.M.

In discussing the relative religious value of the Old Testament books it is of utmost importance for us to realize that we are dealing not with a definite and well-known quantity—but with a mental judgment more or less variable. Not only will different minds answer this question in a different manner, but even the same mind can come to different results according to the standard which he applies when judging of the Old Testament books. This standard may be threefold. First, in order to arrive at a just estimate of its value the religious contents of the Old Testament might be compared with other contemporaneous religious beliefs, notably those of Babylonia and Egypt. The result would be interesting as showing the advanced religious position, occupied by Israel in the ancient Orient. Again the standard with which to compare the religious conceptions of the Old Testament might be the more advanced religious ideas as found in the New Testament. By comparing the two we would be enabled to

* Paper read on August 10, 1904, before the Spiritual Conference of Ministers and Elders of the Reformed Church, held at Mt. Gretna, Pa.

judge of the value which the Old Testament ideas have for us as Christians. By a third process the relative religious value of the Old Testament books can be determined by comparing these books with one another. By making the standard not external but internal. In other words, we may determine which books present the more advanced religious conceptions and which the more primitive. This we conceive to be the purpose of this paper.

Some time ago a musical critic was asked the question as to which was considered the finer music, the oratorios of Haendel or the sonatas of Mozart. The critic answered that their relative value could hardly be determined because they belonged to entirely different spheres of musical art. For the same reason we should not indiscriminately compare the Old Testament books, but we should realize first of all that they belong to different spheres of religious thought. My first aim will be, therefore, to point out the various groups of books and note their characteristics, and secondly, to give some general principles from the application of which the religious contents and value will become evident.

The Old Testament is the record of an actual religious life. Here we see men of God, of the most varied temperaments and abilities, subject to the most varied conditions of society, living a life close to God and trying to turn their fellowmen to Him. They have left us a record of the momentous scenes through which they moved, of the religious and spiritual experiences through which they passed, of the deep convictions which stirred them to action and of the fears, the hopes and aspirations that filled their hearts. As their religious life was many-sided, so the record, which they have left us, reflects this variety of experiences.

All religion, wherever it manifests itself, includes two elements. First, religious beliefs or conceptions of God and man's relation to Him; second, religious acts or worship, by which man expresses his relation to God. These two elements we find in the Old Testament. The first, the religious be-

liefs, are inculcated by a long line of prophets. The second, the religious acts of worship, are prescribed by the order of priests. These two streams, although influencing each other, are yet separate. Both may be called objective, inasmuch as prophets and priests formed but a small body of men among the mass of the people. They stood forth prominently as the representatives of the people, the prophets in religious thought, the priests in religious worship and were each in their respective sphere channels of revelation. The prophets produced the books which are embodied in the second part of the Hebrew Bible, which contain not only the record of their own life and message but also the record of the people's history, for they viewed all history from the religious point of view; it was to them the record of God's dealings with men. The priests, on the other hand, preserved the ritual or what we know as the Hebrew legislation together with such accounts of history as would throw light on origin of the ordinances and their observance in later times. The largest part of the Pentateuch, therefore, together with Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, and finally the prophecies of Ezekiel, form their contributions to the sacred literature of the people.

Over against these books, which we have called objective may be placed another group, which may be termed subjective. It has likewise two subdivisions. One contains those writings which are the expression of personal devotion. They are found in the rich collection of Psalms, considered by many the most precious heritage of the Jewish Church, to which there is no counterpart in the New Testament. The other division consists of the books of wisdom or religious reflection. To this class belong the Proverbs, Job and Ecclesiastes. Summarizing our statements we find that we can divide the Old Testament books, broadly speaking, into four groups: (1) Prophecy or religious instruction, (2) legislation or religious practice, (3) devotion or religious experience, (4) reflection

or religious philosophy.* In each of these groups we may expect to find different conceptions, largely due to different points of view.

Permit me to illustrate this difference by a single example. I select for this purpose the doctrine of the atonement, because it furnishes us with the most striking example of this difference. Let me preface my statements with the remark that the Hebrew verb *kâphar*, which expresses the idea of atoning, means literally to cover, to put out of sight. Beginning then with the extra-ritual passages we find that in them the subject who atones or covers is always God Himself. Jer. 18: 23, "Do not cover their iniquity and their sin do not wipe out from thy sight." Again, Ps. 65: 3, "Iniquities prevail against us, as for our transgressions thou dost cover them." Secondly, the atonement is due to the mercy of God or Jehovah's consideration for His name or the intercession of men. Thus we read in Ps. 78: 38, "They (the people) were not faithful in his covenant. But he, being full of compassion, forgave their iniquity and destroyed them not." The idea that God restrains his anger and forgives for His name's sake is peculiar to the later passages. Thus we read in Isa. 48: 9, "For my name's sake do I defer any anger * * * that I cut thee not off," and Ps. 79: 9, "Cover our sins for thy name's sake." In some cases the atonement or forgiveness was due to the intercession of His servants. In Amos 7: 5, the prophet prays: "O Lord forgive, I beseech thee; how shall Jacob stand? for he is small." In the same manner Moses prayed to the Lord: "Oh, this people have sinned a great sin. Yet now, if thou wilt, forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me out of thy book which thou hast written" (Ex. 32: 31, f.). In the third place, the object which was covered was the sin of the people. Hence Jeremiah says: "Cover not their sin" (Jer. 18: 23).

* This distinction is well brought out by Dr. A. B. Davidson, in his excellent "Theology of the Old Testament," New York, 1904, pp. 14-15, to which the writer is greatly indebted.

Over against these conceptions of the extra-ritual books we find a totally different series of ideas in the ritual passages. Here in the first place it is not God who atones but the priest, or when the atonement is meant for the whole people it is the high priest. It is not necessary to quote any passages; they are well known, as they are scattered over the whole priest code. Secondly the atonement is not left to the mercy of God, the consideration of His name nor the intercession of His servants, but the regular means which are appointed are the various sacrifices. In the third place it is not the sin which is covered, but the sinner who approaches God's presence in His sanctuary. In accordance with this we read, Lev. 17: 11, "The life of the flesh is in the blood and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls" (literally, to put a covering upon your souls).^{*} These three differences in the conception of the atonement which we have noticed go back to the fundamental difference in the conception of God. The extra-ritual scriptures speak of the righteousness of God. He is a ruler, a king and a judge, and deals with sin judicially. The ritual books, notably the Priest Code and Ezekiel, do not refer to God's righteousness at all; they emphasize His holiness. By this they do not mean a single attribute of God, but His whole transcendent being. It is to them a synonym of the Divine.[†]

It is manifestly impossible for me, in the limited space at my disposal, to take up all the various doctrines or conceptions of the Old Testament or even a considerable number of them; all that I can do is to call attention to some general principles which determine and explain the differences that appear.

I remark in the *first place* that a careful and critical study of the Old Testament books reveals a gradual growth of religious ideas. This is quite natural. We have long ac-

^{*} See Davidson's "Theology of the Old Testament," pp. 327-350.

[†] For a correct definition of the Old Testament idea of divine holiness see Davidson, *l. c.*, pp. 144-160.

customed ourselves to look upon creation not as the result of a divine fiat but as the gradual evolution of countless ages, under the quickening influence of God. We find the same principle in religion and revelation; both are a growth. Men do not see the whole truth at once, but they learn to know it piecemeal and gradually. The truth of this statement can best be demonstrated by an example. Take the *idea of God*. Although Israel from the beginning of its history held the belief in one God, it was at first not a pure and simple monotheism, but rather a henotheism, i. e., it involved the admission that other gods existed. While Yahweh was the God of Israel, Baal was the God of the Canaanites and Chemosh the God of the Moabites, etc. This appears not only from the ode of the Red Sea, which rings out triumphantly: "Who is like thee or Yahweh, among the gods;* who is like thee, glorious in loftiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders" (Ex. 15: 11). It is also embodied in the message, which Jephthah sent to the King of the Ammonites: "Wilt thou not possess that which Chemosh thy God giveth thee to possess? (Judges 11: 24). It is the common Semitic idea which we find everywhere that each people or tribe had its own tribal deity and that he ruled only over the territory of his people. This notion underlies the language of David who regards banishment from his home as necessitating the worship of other gods, hence he says to Saul: "If Jehovah has stirred thee up against me, let him smell an offering, but if the children of men, let them be cursed before Jehovah, because they have driven me this day from having a part in the inheritance of Jehovah, saying go and serve other gods." During this same period when Jehovah was still regarded by many as the tribal God of Israel, the conceptions about him were very childlike as we notice, *e. g.*, in the second chap-

* Compare the similar statement in a Babylonian hymn in honor of Bel, to be published by the writer: "Bel the lofty lord, the lord of heaven and earth, the prince, the lord of the universe, the king of the great gods, who in heaven and earth has no equal among the gods."

ter of Genesis. Jehovah forms man like a potter forms a vessel, for the participle of the verb to form means a potter; he speaks to man face to face like a friend, he walks with him in the garden in the cool of the evening. These are evidently very childlike conceptions and they belong to the childhood of the race. Gradually a distinction was made between the real essential being of God, which no eye has even seen, and that part of His being which appears in visible manifestation; the latter is called "the angel of Jehovah." At the beginning of the prophetic period the angel of Jehovah disappears and we find then the more abstract conceptions, the face of Jehovah, the glory of Jehovah and the name of Jehovah substituted, which had been in existence before, but are now used exclusively. Moreover, it was not till the Assyrian period, when the people came in contact with a great world power, that the question of the relation of Jehovah to the world was forced upon them. Then God appeared to them no longer as their tribal deity, but as the God of the universe, who rules the whole world. Here we also meet for the first time an absolute monotheism which does not admit of the existence of any other rival deity. Hence Jehovah is called by Micah "the Lord of the whole earth" (4: 13), and still later we read: "Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth, for I am God and there is no one else" (Isa. 45: 22). I do not mean to deny that the idea of Jehovah as the absolute Lord of the universe dawned occasionally upon the mind of a pious Israelite before the Assyrian period; my only contention is that in the preprophetic period there are distinct traces of a limited idea which absolutely disappear with the rise of the great prophets.

A similar growth of ideas may be noticed in the doctrine of the atonement. We have seen that all the ritual books are filled with regulations about sacrifices as a means of atonement and although the prophets make less of the sacrifices, but emphasize rather the proper moral and spiritual condition of the offerer, yet they all testify to the prominent part which

animal sacrifices played in the religion of the people. It is not till we reach the last chapters of Isaiah that we pass from the animal sacrifices of the Levitical system to the human sacrifice of the suffering servant of Jehovah. This was an immense step in advance. It marked a new epoch in the conception of the atonement.

The *second principle*, to which I wish to call attention, is that different writers approach the truth from different points of view and hence they present different aspects of the truth.

They do not all have the same idea of Jehovah. *Amos*, who is the apostle of righteousness and whose keyword is: "Let judgment roll along as waters and righteousness as a perennial stream" (5: 24), regards Jehovah as a God of righteousness. *Hosea*, who speaks of the relation of Jehovah to his people as that of husband to his wife, regards Jehovah as a God of love, for he says "I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely, because my anger is turned away from them" (14: 4). Again, *Isaiah* in whose opening vision the seraphim sang: "Holy, Holy, Holy is Jehovah of hosts, all the earth is full of his glory" (6: 3), to him Jehovah was a God of holiness and his favorite term of God is the "Holy One of Israel" (1: 4; 5: 19, 24; 10: 17, 20; 12: 6; 17: 7, etc.). The idea of holiness is still further developed by *Ezekiel*, the creator of Judaism, or the Jewish religion after the exile. He gave to his fellowmen the elaborate program partly carried out by the reformation of Ezra and Nehemiah, which had for its ultimate object the preservation of the holiness of Jehovah.

To these different conceptions of Jehovah naturally correspond different conceptions of sin. To *Amos*, who regards God as the righteous ruler of the world, sin is chiefly unrighteousness or injustice. Hence he charges the people: "They afflict the just, they take a bribe and they turn aside the poor in the gate from their right" (5: 12). To *Hosea*, whose idea of God is love, sin is alienation of the heart or unfaithfulness, hence God says of Israel: "She went after

her lovers and forgot me" (2: 13), while *Isaiah*, who conceives of God as the transcendent Holy One of Israel, looks upon sin as pride, hence he predicts that "the day of the Lord shall come upon every one that is proud and lofty and upon every one that is lifted up and they shall be brought low" (2: 12).*

Sometimes the difference of conception is due to the difference of temperament. Amos, who was not sensitive and emotional, announces the doom of Israel with the sternness of a judge, while Hosea, who is tender and whose heart is full of sympathy, pleads with his people with the most eager solicitude, and urges them to return to Jehovah to be healed. The same difference we notice later in *Isaiah* and *Jeremiah*, the first brilliant, broad-minded, fearless and stern, the other naturally timid, for you all remember what he said when called by the Lord: "O Lord, God! behold, I cannot speak; for I am a child" (1: 6), and, although strengthened by the Lord for his work, he remains the prophet of tears, whose tender heart was wrung by the calamities of his people. Both of these instances furnish instructive illustrations of the manner in which widely different natural temperaments became organs of revelation and how each by his very nature was the better adapted to set forth different aspects of the truth.

A *third principle* which I wish to emphasize is that the difference of religious conceptions is determined by the circumstances and conditions under which each writer lived. Truth is never presented abstractly but concretely. It is not the philosophy of the schools, but it consists of religious teaching intended for the school of life. It was adapted to the needs of the hour. History was the soil upon which prophecy grew. If we wish therefore to understand the real significance of the Old Testament conceptions we must endeavor to discover the circumstances under which they originated. This is often exceedingly difficult and sometimes even

* See Davidson, "Theology of the Old Testament," p. 203.

impossible, hence a number of intricate problems in Old Testament theology still await their solution.

Let me illustrate the statement, that history is the key to the correct understanding of the Old Testament books, by an example. The destruction of Jerusalem, the deportation of the Jews and their consequent exile in Babylonia was politically one of the worst disasters which ever befell the Jewish people, for it ended practically their separate national existence. Looked at from a doctrinal point of view, however, it was the greatest blessing that ever came to the Jews and contributed more to the advancement of religious thought than any other single event in the history of the people. After the destruction of Jerusalem the Jewish people never enjoyed national independence and material prosperity. And yet, most wonderfully to say, it was during this period of great outward depression that they reached the highest thoughts regarding God and themselves. Before the exile the nation was the religious center, all blessings were poured out upon the nation as such, all promises for the future were attached to the nation, now the time came when the nation ceased to exist, but God still remained and the Jewish religion and the individual Israelite remained, and hence we find that the religious center is shifted from the nation to the individual, and that was brought about by the exile. This momentous change is heralded by Jeremiah, who gives expression to the conviction that the old order of things will come to an end. All that made Israel distinct as a nation, its institutions as well as its prophets and priests will disappear. They shall no more teach every man his neighbor and every man his brother saying, "know the Lord, for they shall all know me from the least of them unto the greatest of them." God will put His law into their inward parts and write it upon their hearts, the law shall cease to be an external threat, it will become an internal and spiritual force of life and conduct. "Behold the days come saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of

Judah * * * and I will be their God and they shall be my people" (31: 31-34).

Corresponding to this sublime conception of a new covenant, as found in the thirty-first chapter of Jeremiah, there is the still more evangelical prophecy of the new heart, as found in the thirty-sixth chapter of Ezekiel. "I will take you from the nations and bring you into your own land. And I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean. A new heart also will I give you and a new spirit will I put within you * * * and ye shall keep my judgments and do them. Then shall you remember your evil ways and ye shall loathe yourselves because of your iniquities" (36: 24-27). This is the loftiest idea that Ezekiel presents of forgiveness, regeneration, the spirit of God as the principle of a new life and the keeping of God's law as the result of such a life. It is the nearest approach to the teaching of the New Testament for every element of Paul's doctrine of salvation finds its parallel in this glorious anticipation of the Hebrew prophet.

But Ezekiel did not only grasp the true significance of a personal religion, he is also the real champion of individual freedom and individual responsibility. In the eighteenth and the thirty-third chapter of his prophecy we see, as has been well said by Professor Davidson,* "the birth of the individual mind taking place before our eyes." To his contemporaries in exile, who were chafing under the old doctrine that they were suffering for the sins of their fathers Ezekiel announced the startling doctrine: "The soul that sinneth it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son" (18: 20). In other words, every man is only responsible for his own deeds. But Ezekiel advances much farther and asserts that the moral freedom of the individual goes so far that he can break with his own past. There is in him a personality which can rise even above its nature and not only break with

* *L. c.*, p. 358.

it but rule it and with the help of God shake off its moral fetters and be redeemed. This conviction he states clearly and distinctly: "When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he has committed and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive" (18: 27). These utterances of Ezekiel belong to the most important truths to be found in the Old Testament, for they make religion not an affair of the state, but of the individual. They place the individual soul face to face with its creator. And to that truth the New Testament has not been able to add an iota. There are some scholars who look with contempt upon Ezekiel as a narrow-minded and bigotted zealot. But such a view fails utterly to appreciate his character and the importance of his labors. His influence was far reaching and although, in his anticipation of the future, he did not rise above the national limits, yet in his profound teaching, especially his doctrine of personal freedom, he has added an important contribution to religious thought and has led his people to a better conception of the truth.†

I remark in the *fourth place* that in studying the religious contents of the Old Testament books we must distinguish between the popular religion and the real contribution to Old Testament revelation. This will become especially clear to us when we turn to the eschatology of the Old Testament.

To die meant for the early Israelites to go down to Sheol. The conceptions of Sheol were no doubt based upon the grave. Sheol was the grave only enlarged and more mysterious. Sheol was thought to be in "the lower parts of the earth" (Ez. 31: 16) or "under the waters" (Job 26: 5). Job describes it as "a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where light is darkness" (Job 10: 22). It is the eternal house (Eccles. 12: 5), the house appointed for all the living (Job 30: 23),

† For an adequate representation of Ezekiel's greatness see H. P. Smith's "Old Testament History," and Professor Kautzsch in his "Religion of Israel," Hasting's "Dictionary of the Bible," Vol. V., pp. 701-705.

the land of silence (Ps. 94: 17). Those who dwell in this land are called Rephaim or shadows, literally the faint (Job 26: 5). Their condition is one of silence and forgetfulness. "The living know that they must die, but the dead know not anything. Also their love and their hatred and their envy, is now perished" (Eccles. 9: 5). Yet though feeble, they know their condition for they are represented as asking the Babylonian King: "Art thou become weak as one of us" (Isa. 14: 10). The small and the great are there alike and the servant is free from his master (Job 3: 17, 19). There is no distinction between good and evil, for Samuel tells Saul: "To-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me" (I. Sam. 28: 19). The dead cannot return to earth and know nothing of the affairs of earth, for Job says: "his sons came to honor and he knoweth it not; they are brought low and he perceiveth it not of them" (Job 14: 21). But more important still all fellowship with God ceases in Sheol, hence the Psalmist says: "In death there is no remembrance of thee, in Sheol who can give thee thanks" (Ps. 6: 5). God's care does not extend to Sheol, for the Psalmist asks, full of agony in the face of death: "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead, shall the dead arise and praise thee? Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave and thy faithfulness in the pit?" To all these anxious questions he must give a decided no and hence he pleads with God for prolonged life.

Such were the conceptions of Sheol and the condition of the dead in Sheol. These conceptions were not peculiar to Israel; they were shared by all the Semitic people, especially the Babylonians, as we can prove by their literature.* They were the popular substratum, upon which the real contribution of the Old Testament was built up. The development of the Old Testament consisted in the conflict with and triumph over these popular notions.

This development took place along two lines.† First, the

* See especially A. Jeremias, "Die Babylonisch-Assyrischen Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode," Leipzig, 1887.

† Davidson, *l. c.*, p. 442 *seq.*

idea of death as a separation from God was denied. Fellowship with God means life and that life death cannot break. Thus there arose the doctrine of *immortality*. Now this is much more than mere existence. No one had doubted that the personality of man does not cease to exist at death. The doctrine of Sheol shows plainly a universal belief in continued existence. But this existence was mere vegetation. The doctrine of immortality stood for more than mere shadowy existence, it was continued fellowship with God. At first the Hebrew saints seem to have acquiesced in death. They continued to live in their people, in their children and in the good name and blessed memory which a righteous man leaves behind him. They were satisfied to lose themselves in the larger unit, the people. But when at the time of the exile the individual rose to greater prominence we notice also the new conception of an individual immortality, based upon the earlier idea of a national immortality. The new idea is expressed in the book of Job. After having gone through many conflicts and struggles, which led him to curse the day of his birth, Job finally conquered doubt and uncertainty when he exclaimed: "I know that my Redeemer (Vindicator) liveth and after this my body is destroyed, then free from my flesh I shall see God, whom I shall see for myself and mine eyes shall behold and not another" (Job 19: 25). This same idea is found in three or four late Psalms. (Ps. 16: 11): "Thou wilt show me the path of life; in thy presence is joy and at thy right hand there are pleasures forever more." (Ps. 17: 15): "I shall behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy image." Although it is not quite certain that this refers to awakening after the sleep of death. (Ps. 49: 15): "But God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol; for he shall take me." The verb "take" is the same which is used in the experience of Enoch, of whom it is said that "God took him" (Gen. 5: 24). (Ps. 73: 24): "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward take me to glory." Finally there is one more passage in

Isa. 26: 19: "Thy dead shall live, my dead ones shall arise." We thus find that this doctrine of a personal immortality is confined to Job, a late passage in Isaiah and four late, probably post-exilic, Psalms.

The second line of development took its start from the national destruction and consequent national resurrection, predicted by many prophets. Israel as a people could not cease to exist and though the threatened destruction of Jerusalem would break up its national unity, yet Phoenix-like it would rise to new life and continue its career as the religious benefactor of the world. This was the firm conviction of the prophets. Thus Hosea says: "Let us return to the Lord. After two days he will revive us, and the third day he will raise us up and we shall live in his sight" (6: 2). And again: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction" (13: 14). This national resurrection is still more wonderfully described by Ezekiel in his remarkable vision of the valley of dry bones (chap. 37). These bones rose to new life through the breath of God. It was a prophecy of the restored commonwealth of Israel.

But gradually the idea of a national resurrection developed into the idea of a personal resurrection. This transition we notice in two passages. In the passage of Isa. 26: 19, already quoted: "Thy dead shall live, my dead ones shall arise, awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust." But the doctrine is most fully and clearly stated in Daniel 12: 2, "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

These two doctrines, the doctrine of immortality which teaches that the fellowship of the soul with God cannot be broken, that for the righteous Sheol does not exist, but that like Enoch he passes into the presence of God; and the doctrine of resurrection, these two thoughts are the real con-

tributions of the Old Testament to eschatology, which set the popular view of a Sheol aside.

My task has come to an end. I have brought before you some of the varied contents of the Old Testament. I have pointed out to you some of the loftiest religious conceptions which have become an important part of the New Testament. There are many others, equally profound, of God and man, of sin and righteousness, which we were not able to discuss, but the few glimpses which you have had of the wide range of Old Testament thought must have convinced you that it will never cease to be of highest value to the Christian Church and that like the Hebrew saints of old we shall continue to draw comfort and inspiration from its spiritual treasures.

II.

THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENT IN AMERICAN LIFE.

REV. C. CLEVER, D.D.

The office of religion in the formation of national character is not always appreciated by the historian. The rush and noise of battle, the intellectual triumphs of the hustings and forum, the splendid achievements of human genius and the rapid accumulation of wealth have a special charm for the muse of history. To her, generally, prayer books do not compare with fat ledgers. Upper rooms, where men and women hold fellowship with God, seem insignificant in comparison with the rush and carnage of battlefields. The strenuous activities of modern life gorge the ear with their babel confusions, so that the still small voice which nerves the prophet is despised and rejected. To Gibbon the struggles of the catacombs, and the swelterings of the arena were but the vaporings of an overheated imagination. When Hume has seen the giants of Reformation story stalking across that great stage, and listened to those utterances that were louder than the bellowing of ten thousand bulls from the Vatican, he contemptuously speaks of it as a cawing of jackdaws. To Buckle the march of English civilization is but the fatalistic play of force, as destitute of moral significance as the flowing stream out of the tangled wildwood. To such historians men and events come and go, as though religion had never appeared upon the earth; and God was as estranged from the course of history, as the dead man from the watch that his skill had fashioned. But to the practiced eye of him who can see the angels of God ascending and descending, and feel that the nations are coworkers together with God, all is changed. Then the thoughts of men widen by the process

of the suns in ever-increasing circles of grace and beauty, all moving under the rhythmic guidance of God. Jesus is heard saying unto the nation come, and they come, and, to others go and they go. The kings of the earth that set themselves against the Lord and against His annointed are broken in pieces. The nations that forget God are cast into hell. When faith, duty and religion are relegated to the shades of forgetfulness, then patriotism, statesmanship and sacrifice for the perpetuity of the nation vanish as mists before the rising sun. The pursuit of wealth, lives of luxury and leisure and a general engrossment with the material things of time and sense endanger the existence of any republic. They nullify the principles upon which the fathers of the Republic erected the structure, which was at first the admiration of the other nations of the earth, but has at length become their astonishment. In looking at the lives, and listening to the conversations of those who laid the foundations of these great commonwealths, we will have the best illustration of religious patriotism; and when we shall follow in their footsteps and contend with the same holy purpose for the perpetuity of life of the Republic, we shall give a conspicuous example to generations yet unborn of patriotic religion.

The civil institutions of the Republic owe their glory and promise of perpetuity to the religious character of those who wrought with such Titanic energy upon their broad foundations. For the temple of liberty cornerstones were laid, arches swung, and the architraves hewed, when righteousness was laid to the line and judgment to the plummet. They built much better than they knew, because they built after the pattern that was shown them in the mount. Their sons and their daughters were prophesying, their old men were dreaming dreams, and their young men were seeing visions. By faith they conquered a new world. They had restored unto them the years that the locust had eaten, the canker worm and the caterpillar.

If it has been said with truth that the education of a boy should begin one hundred years before he was born, in a far higher sense may it be said that the making of a patriot must begin centuries before he was born. The roots of characters which bear the burden and heat of the day, lie back in the unknown deeps of buried centuries. Statesmen and warriors who live to show that there is a God in Israel; and are determined that all the earth shall be awakened to a like sense have been born out of the spiritual travail of many centuries of struggle upward and onward, toward the sunlit hills of God. The men who toiled for us, and to whose fidelity and courage we owe the blessings of civil liberty, were the results of influences that enjoyed sunrisings in other ages, and in other climes. To the Reformation times we look for a new map of humanity, for a new life spring of civilization, because men were made to feel a new consciousness of personal responsibility. They stood up a great army. By a new study of the Bible, and a new conception of christian manhood, they began to feel that liberty of thought and action were inalienable rights guaranteed to man by God. The liberty of a christian man, red hot from the burning heart of the great Saxon Reformer, was but the prelude of the Declaration of Independence. In that sublime upheaval "when worlds were charging and heaven beholding," there was an active preparation for all subsequent ages. Here American ideas were being evolved, which in time would necessitate Bunker Hill and Yorktown, Gettysburg and Appomattox Court House. It formed one of the grandest eras of human history, and of all the breathing, burning, bubbling thoughts that sprang out of that hour of spiritual travail, none presented a sublimer spectacle than those which have been incarnated in American life.

The Reformation was followed by Puritanism in England. This added another star to Anglo-Saxon glory. The Magna Charta made it possible, but the new spiritual ideas of personal responsibility to a supreme God gave it an impetus that

carried everything before it. It is one of the flies in the ointment of our modern American life, that we sneer at such a splendid homespun ancestry. It was a people who held principles that were eternal. These men were overawed with a sense of personal responsibility, and believed in God. There were times when they were severe against every form of amusement and dissipation, but it was because they were dreadfully in earnest for the extension of the Kingdom of Truth. Cromwell and Milton, Hampden and Pym and the thousand and one unknown warriors for truth in that age whose names are in the Lamb's book of life were the worthy descendants of Zwingli, Luther and Calvin. If Zwingli would not have made the Alpine heights ring with the Gospel message, if Luther had not nailed the 95 theses on the church door of Wittenberg, which necessitated the freedom of the Christian man, if John Calvin would not have stood like a stone wall against the anarchy, licentiousness and cruel oppression of free thought and free speech, insisting with all the high priestly nature of one who had seen the burning bush with bared feet, and heard the I Am speaking out of the fire, Cromwell could never have put his foot upon the neck of a king, nor Milton have written the *Areopagitica* insisting with all the force of his genius that truth can be established only by the freest interchange of thought.

Leaving the continent then, we watch the newer development of religious and civil liberty, as the outcome of the actions of men who were overpowered with a sense of personal responsibility. The great inspiration, which they gave to our fathers, nerved them to wrestle so successfully with the problems of civil government united with the principles of civil liberty. "God sifted in these conflicts a whole nation, that He might send choice grain over into this wilderness; and the blood and persecution of the martyrs became the seed of both the church and the state." Roger Williams and Penn, Patrick Henry and Witherspoon, George Calvert and Oglethorpe, Otis and Adams, Washington and Jefferson

could, without any violent twisting of the genealogical branches, trace their political line to Wycliffe and Lord Cobham, Pym and Hampden, Milton and Cromwell. In this day, when political bastards too frequently set themselves down in the high places, clad in the unclean garments of unrighteousness, we are not surprised that personal responsibility and obligations to the God of nations rest lightly upon the hearts of statesmen and administrators of sacred trust. Offices become the object of selfish and ambitious demagogues. To the victors belong all the spoils that can be pilfered from the public crib. Mr. Cleveland deserves the gratitude of the American public for insisting that a public office is a public trust. It was the Puritanism in his blood that made him the exponent of a sentiment worthy of the best days of the Revolution.

The prevalence of the religious elements in the lives of the Fathers of the Republic is a potent fact. We must read between the lines to find anything else. These were the strands in the golden thread by which they bound America forever fast to the feet of God. "Be assured"—says Grimke—"if the American citizen rightly comprehends the genius of Christianity, the spirit of our institutions, the character of the age in which he lives, he must be deeply imbued with the benign, masculine, thoughtful spirit of religion." We are always in danger of glorifying our philosophy, our arts, our politics, our wealth but forgetting that all these things in themselves are but the steam engine without the power to hurry it along its iron pathway. Any one or all of these, without the quickening influence of great lives, instinct with responsibility to an overruling Providence, would have ended in so much smoke. Blot the triumphs of Christianity out of the pages of American history and what would our laws have been? What our civilization? And that form of Christianity which has wrought these miraculous changes for us, I want to say, once and for all, is Protestant. Christianity is in a more profound sense than can be said

of any other nation an indispensable condition for our republican form of government. It is the oil, with which the waning lamp of liberty will ever light itself anew. It is woven into every texture of our social, intellectual and moral life. Our fathers felt that Christianity alone could give gentleness and justice to our laws, and that customs that could bring healing to blistered and bleeding humanity must be permeated by the holy, healthful Gospel of the Son of Mary and the Son of God. "Through the vista of history we see slavery and its Pagan theory of two races fall before the holy word of Jesus—all men are children of God." "Culture of intellect, without religion in the heart is only civilized Barbarism and disguised animalism." It was a large sprinkling of the religious sentiment that drove Isabella of Aragon to espouse, in such a substantial manner, the cause of the disheartened Columbus and enabled him finally to execute his cherished ideal of adding a new continent to the nations of the old world. The founders of the great commonwealth of the Revolutionary days were always mindful of their sacred duty to extend the borders of the Kingdom of God. In 1660 the people of Massachusetts sent an address to Charles II., of England, in which the following words breathing a genuine apostolic earnestness occur: "Your servants are true men, fearing God and the King. We could not live without the public worship of God; and that we might enjoy the divine worship without human mixtures, we, not without tears, departed from our country, kindred and fathers' houses." From the early settlers in Connecticut we find the same abounding zeal for religion. On the fourth day of June, 1639, the emigrants, men of distinguished faith met to organize the first civil society and government with a written constitution. A sermon was preached, and a constitution was formed which was the first example of a written constitution, as a distinct organic act constituting a government and defining its power. In this instrument of writing occurs the following: "We do therefore associate

and enjoin ourselves to be as one public state or commonwealth, and do enter into combination and confederation to maintain and preserve the liberty and purity of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." In the charter of 1609 granted to Virginia it is declared: "The principal effect which we can desire or expect of this action is the conversion and reduction of the people, in those parts, into the true worship of God and the christian religion." Founded upon such principles of everlasting truth Virginia became the mother of Presidents, some of whom taken all in all were the greatest among the children of men, since Anno Domini 100. In the charter granted by Charles I. to Lord Baltimore it was declared: "The grantee was actuated by a laudable zeal for extending the Christian religion, and the territory of the British empire; and if any doubt should ever arise concerning the true meaning of the charter, there should be no construction of it derogatory to the Christian Religion." When the Christian emigrants touched the shores of Georgia their first act was to kneel and "return thanks to God for their having safely arrived in Georgia. Our end in leaving our native land is not to gain riches and honor, but simply this, to live wholly to the glory of God, to make Georgia a religious colony, having no theory but devotion, no ambition but to quicken the sentiment of piety." The first legislative act passed at Chester in December, 1682, speaks of the end of a true civil government to be "to enact such laws as shall best preserve true christian and civil liberty in opposition to all unchristian, licentious and unjust practices." In the judgment of William Penn, according to Bancroft, "Government derived neither its obligations nor powers from man. God was to him the beginning and the end of government. He thought of government as a part of religion itself. Christians should keep the helm and guide the vessel of state." At this time the idea of the *Social Contract* had bewitched the nations of the old world, and its siren attractiveness was hurrying France on to the throes of a revolution when unbelief

would do its worst, gorging the guillotine with blood, and enthroning a prostitute upon the great altar of Notre Dame. We should be thankful that the influence of the religious sentiment exercised such architectonic power at such a crisis in the history of the world. With such universal testimonies, as to the Christian motives of the founders of the original colonies, we need not wonder that patriotism, duty and religion were prime factors in the lives of these men. A state in their judgment could only claim security, and set out upon an honorable career of humanization, when founded upon the principles and person of Jesus Christ. Otherwise it was founded upon the sand, and when the storms of revolution and anarchy would break upon the ship of state, it would be driven, as by a cyclone of desolation and death, upon the rock-bound coast of everlasting destruction.

The same lesson is borne in upon us with increasing power, when we listen to the long roll of christian men, who faced the front of the battle with a courage that never knew a fear. James Otis among the first and foremost champions of liberty was educated in a minister's family. His creed is embodied in a sentence of an address, delivered when the birth throes of the revolution were shaking the very powers of heaven, "Government springs from the necessities of our nature, and has an everlasting foundation in the unchangable will of God." Joseph Warren, whose spilled blood consecrated Bunker Hill long before Webster thrilled the world with his splendid oratory, at the consecration of its monument, said: "May this Almighty Being graciously preside in all our counsels. May He direct us to such measures, as He Himself will approve and be pleased to bless. May we ever be a people favored of God." Patrick Henry, who steadied the tide of the Revolution, when it was about to go down in an ebb that meant centuries of waste, was a profound believer in the divinity of Christianity and declared its necessity as much for governments and nations, as for the salvation of individuals. Brave, heroic, stalwart John Hancock, than whom

a nobler patriot never drew breath, was the son of a clergyman of Braintree, Massachusetts, and noted throughout all the land for his piety and benevolence. John Adams, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, the first vice-president and the second president of the United States, the head of a family that has kept its prestige throughout all the changes of a century and a quarter of the life of the Republic, was a firm believer in Christianity. He was a distinguished member of the church, and clung to the Christian religion as the sheet-anchor of hope for his country no less than for himself. Jefferson said of him, a man more perfectly honest never came from the hand of the Creator. Robert Treat Payne, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, was a decided and a firm believer in the divine origin of Christianity, and was fully convinced that its principles could alone be the foundation of commonwealths, which would give any promise of permanence. Roger Sherman, the ardent and incorruptible patriot, the ripe Christian statesman, always adorned the profession of Christianity made in his youth, with an allegiance that defied every blast of unbelief that blew upon him from the desolate shores of doubt. Mr. Jefferson on one occasion pointing out to some friends the different members of congress said: That is Mr. Sherman, of Connecticut, who never said a foolish thing in his life. But time would fail me to tell of Livingston and Witherspoon, and Mason, of Gouverneur Morris and Benjamin Rush, of Fisher Ames, Robert Morris, Alexander Hamilton, Charles Carroll, John Jay, James Madison, Trumbull and Washington, all of whom counted it *the* privilege of their lives to be numbered among the followers of the lowly Nazarene. These men, whose broad shoulders bore the weightiest burdens ever laid upon the founders of a state, received strength from fellowship with Jesus. They satisfied the everlasting cravings of hearts beating high for the principles of liberty and equality, by drinking deeply from the waters of Siloah that go softly from the throne of God.

In giving them all the aureole that should encircle their brows we need not be blind to the fact that they walked this earth as men. I heard the late Professor John Fiske say in an address that history had smoothed out the wrinkles that had been worn in the characters of some of our most cherished heroes. For instance George Washington on a certain occasion was not obeyed to the letter by one of his subalterns. History says that the eminent commander said things have come to a pretty pass when orders can be so easily disregarded but what George really said was things have come to a devil of a pass when orders can be so easily disregarded.

These civil institutions, of which we are so justly proud, were planned by men who perceived the beauty and strength of the Bible. Green in his "Short History of the English People" says: "No greater moral change ever passed over a nation than passed over England during the years which parted the middle of the reign of Elizabeth from the meeting of the Long Parliament. England became the people of a book and that book was the Bible. It was as yet the one English book that was familiar to every English man. It was read at churches, and read at home, and everywhere its words as they fell on ears which custom had not deadened to their force and beauty kindled a startling enthusiasm." Remembering the intimacy of the kinship between English Puritanism and all of our civil institutions, we are not surprised that the American statesman of the Revolutionary period made so much of that book, which is in such a strict sense the foundation of law and morality. When the dark shadows of war began to settle so heavily upon the sturdy people, who had been nourished upon such spiritual pabulum, the failure of the supply of Bibles from London was viewed with alarm. It was felt that without a plentiful sprinkling of these leaves of light from the tree of life which would be for the healing of the nation the fires of devotion and patriotism would soon die out. At this crisis Dr. Patrick Allison, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, of Baltimore,

one of the chaplains, brought the subject to the attention of congress. It was memorialized to print an edition of the Holy Scripture. The matter was referred to a committee which reported on the eleventh day of September, 1777. After careful investigation it was found that paper and type for such an undertaking could not be secured. Type could be imported, but at a cost that precluded the experiment. It was resolved however that instead of this the committee on commerce should be directed to import 20,000 copies of the Bible. We can easily imagine what a howl would go up from some of the arch unbelievers of that excited time, when congress determined that Bibles should be imported at the expense of the government for the education of the people.

But those who have been purified in the fires of the Revolution and felt themselves burdened with the perplexing problems of the new republic knew too well the mollifying influence a careful study of the Bible exerted upon the minds of those who were to be trained to appreciate the seriousness of universal suffrage and free citizenship. A little later on, in 1782, a resolution was passed by congress recommending an edition of the Bible that had been printed by a Rev. Mr. Aitken. Staid congressmen found it congenial with the best interests of the people, who were to enjoy and perpetuate freedom, that the Bible should be untrammelled, and go forth as free as the air that swept down from the mountains, which were strangers to the sound of the woodman's ax. Chancellor Kent, one of the most eminent jurists the country produced, says: The general diffusion of the Bible is the most effective way to civilize and humanize mankind; to purify and exalt the general system of public morals; to give efficacy to the just precepts of international and municipal law, to enforce the observance of prudence, justice and fortitude and to improve all the relations of domestic and social life."

These men in whom the fires of patriotism glowed with such an intense heat, that they burned up every vestige of dross and selfishness, felt the regenerating influence of Bible study.

Without the guidance of this pillar of cloud by day and pillar of fire by night, it would be utterly impossible to establish the state upon an enduring and equable basis. Guided by the experience of the past, they found no better way to accomplish their task, than to be continually referring to the precepts which God had given for the guidance of men, reaching out after the higher and better things. These for them were not scattered about listlessly in the literatures of the world, but had been recorded in their purity and simplicity in the Old and New Testament. The Bible was as necessary for the republic as for individual character. Civil government, upon the basis of the Bible, was the watchword under which the grand processional moved forward, and hesitated not to lay out millions of treasure and blood, that flowed with sacramental efficacy, that we might enjoy the precious inheritance bequeathed to us under the inspiration of ideals abounding with the most sacred instincts of the race. There was a felt need of a divine providence in history. In looking back over the past, we see careering over the waves of a well nigh unknown sea a little ship, called the Mayflower. There were no card tables or smoking rooms, in that child of the deep, where men played and lost their hard earnings; and with cursings and oaths launched their red hot invectives at those who had outwitted them. They were much in prayer and covenant making. They wanted these covenants to be founded upon the Bible. When they were convinced that what they were to sign had the favor of God resting upon it, they opened the veins in their arms, that they might seal it with blood. They had set sail redolent with the breath of God upon them, their souls bathed in divine trust, and their expectancy aroused because of the admonition of the pilgrim preacher, that more new truth would yet be discovered in the Bible. Next to the Ark that bore the hopes of the whole world, the most significant craft that ever committed its keel to the turbulent waters of old ocean was the Mayflower.

From a persistent study of the Bible their souls were fired with the noblest ideals possible to humankind. They heard the footsteps of the Mighty God walking in the evening time, and with their souls fretted with the grave responsibilities imposed upon them, they listened and were calm. They felt themselves filled with the same spirit that Moses enjoyed as he stood before the burning bush and heard the voice of God bidding him go forward, assuring him of his continual guidance and favor. Jefferson who is sometimes spoken of as an unbeliever said, in his first message to congress: "I shall need the favor of that Being, in whose hands we are, who led our fathers as Israel of old from their native land and planted them in a country flowing with the necessities and comforts of life." We can take some of the richest pages of the Bible, crowded with some of the most splendid providences ever vouchsafed to man, and changing the names of the people delivered, and the times in which they were manifested, and they will do for our American story. This is so because men under the precepts of the Bible arranged themselves upon the side of God and under the overshadowings of the Almighty.

They met the tyrant's brandished steel,
The lion's gory mane;
They bowed their necks the death to feel
Who follows in their train?

Another fact, that appears prominent in early American history, was the sacredness with which the Sabbath day was kept. They had no Sunday newspapers, no Sunday excursions, no Sunday concerts. These things would have seemed to them the abomination of desolation standing in the high places. To have encouraged them would have seemed like helping the man of sin to sit down in the temple of God and make himself as God. It is just possible, that some of them would have regarded it as a sin to kiss his wife on the Sabbath day, but you can rest assured he would not have been found kissing another man's wife either

on the Sabbath day or during the week either. Some of them would not have kindled a fire on the Sabbath day, but neither would they have needed an asbestos casket to assure their safety after going out into the other world. The Sabbath in its moral and political significance, in its humanizing effects upon society was regarded by the statesmen of the Revolution as one of the important bulwarks of the sacred edifice, upon which they had wrought with such marked effects.

The Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, in 1775, Resolved, "That it be recommended by this congress to the people of all ranks and denominations that they not only pay a religious regard to that day and to the public worship of God thereon, but that they also use their influence to discountenance and suppress any profanation thereof in others." "And whereas there is great danger that the profanation of the Lord's day will prevail in the camp, we earnestly recommend to all the officers not only to set a good example, but that they strictly require of their soldiers to keep up a religious regard of that day, and attend upon the public worship of God there, so far as may be consistent with other duties." An examination of the constitution will convince the most careless reader, that the day of rest was to be sacredly observed by those in the higher places. Article 1, section 7, says: "If any bill shall not be returned by the president within ten days (Sunday excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law in like manner as if he had signed it." In adopting this provision, it was presumed by the people of the United States that the chief executive should not be required to give the sacred hours of the Lord's Day to public business. A desecration of the Sabbath Day has been regarded by the Supreme Court as an offence against the common law. It was argued that a well-kept Sabbath was a foundation principle of free government inasmuch as it is a necessity grounded in the very nature of things. It was as necessary for the development of high national ideals, as sunshine for a green sward or showers for a golden harvest.

Men who are loyal to their Lord and to His day cannot be disloyal to their land.

But possibly we may be chided for lingering at too great a length upon the glories of the past. Upon the stern of the Ship of State we have been casting our eyes, wistfully almost, to the shores from which we set sail. We are sure we have started out with a captain, who is good enough to be a Sunday-school superintendent, with a pilot abounding in Christian perfections, and with a crew eschewing profanity with all the care of a peripatetic Sunday-school lecturer. We are now impatiently urged to stand upon the prow of the vessel, and measuring the strength of the tempest that vexes the waters over which we must sail, see whether all these things do not seem like a parable. The waves of anarchy and confusion are seen chasing each other as if eager to engulf the nation. Hands once confident are now listlessly hanging down. Voices once instinct with prophetic fire are dumb, the skies are lowering, the mutterings of discontent are being heard from hamlet and dell, as well as from the crowded thoroughfares of the congested cities of the land. Men seem to be trusting in horses and chariots rather than in the God of our fathers.

For the moment we may stagger a little, our compass does seem to have forgotten the star whereby it has given guidance to the years that are gone. The chart is all crumpled in the hands of the excited pilot, to whose watchful care we have given all that we hold dear. But let us not give way to needless fear. Some of the prophecies of the past were as doleful as any that a sane American would dare utter now alone in a dark cellar. When Thomas Jefferson became president, a large portion of the religious element of the United States saw the woeful shadow of the guillotine rising, and revolutionary violence and anarchy springing up as willows by the water courses. A minister of England, a little earlier, mocked at the foolish dream of American independence. "As for the future grandeur of America, and it being a rising empire under one head, whether Republican or Monarchical, it is one

of the idlest and most visionary notions that was ever conceived, even by writers of romance." This ecclesiastical worthy wanders on through a Sahara of such dry rot; and worse than all found a crowd of willing and believing hearers. The new constitution was on the verge of being wrecked on account of the distrust of one party against the other. The working men of Massachusetts were ready to spring to arms on account of imaginary oppression by those in power. So violent was the opposition to the principles of government, then in a very inchoate state, 'tis true, that an English traveller reported that he found some English and Frenchmen in America but no Americans. I believe we are safe in asserting that in public life to-day there is more sobriety, manhood, patriotism and sterling integrity than in any time during the history of the Republic.

When the storm shall break, men will lean heavily upon the same eternal principles which have proven so efficacious in the past. A sense of personal responsibility is revealing itself, with an intensity to which former ages were strangers. The spirit of altruism, roused by the teachings of the Carpenter of Nazareth, is opening bursting pocketbooks, and with bewildering amplitude gold is being scattered about for the amelioration of suffering humanity. The current is set with such energy that, unless checked by some outburst of hellish hate, it will be regarded shortly as a disgrace for a man to die rich. The problems of labor and capital, poverty and wealth, education and ignorance in such proximity are crowding upon us, but the solution is near at hand.

America still believes in God. It requires an oceanic amplitude of jaw to give utterances to atheism. There are men in public life whose lives are as pure as can be made in the present status of our march to the national ideal. Garfield and McKinley and Bayard and Morrill and Thurman and Hendricks and Harrison and many among the living are worthy to be ranked among the best names that grace the cleanest pages of human history.

But the problems, ah! the problems. We are thankful for problems like those which confront the American republic. We sing a *Te Deum* when we find our government insisting that the golden rule can be applied to the settlement of the intricacies of oriental politics. For the sake of a momentary political triumph we will cry imperialism or anti-imperialism, but the hand of American politics will be felt in the policies that shall finally be reached, when wars shall cease to the ends of the earth. In a presidential campaign there may be a tremendous amount of mud-slinging, but in the end the saner judgment of the men to whom has been committed the splendid right of universal suffrage will prevail in the interests of liberty and truth.

America still believes in the Bible. Some of its interpretations, which were so fondly cherished by our fathers, must be given up. New conceptions and new views of truth, new discoveries in science and new explorations will give some different settings to some of the most sacred truths recorded for nations and individuals. But when the relation of employer to employed becomes so strained and intricate, that political economy becomes bewildered, the same teachings of the political economy of the New Testament will come like the voice of the Lord, and the balm healing will fall upon men's hearts fretted into a fury that threatens to defy the majesty of the law. When luxury and license run riot, as the result of the increase of wealth and leisure, the beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount will arouse the lagging heart, sickening even unto death. When opportunity and power will be used for selfish gratification, till the heart shall be atrophied and sinewed out of feeling and reverence, men will rejoice in the revelation that greatness is to be found alone in service. A well-kept Sabbath is still an essential element in the attainment of the highest and holiest manhood. Poor, benumbed, bewitched, bleeding humanity will learn that man being more than body and mind even must worship. It is grounded in the very nature of man. No nation without a well-kept Sab-

bath can hope to reach the highest ideal physically, socially or morally. In his farewell address Washington said: "Let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles." It is because of our religion, our altruism, our ideals that these problems press upon us. When men's wants are few, and the ideals are low, and the passions bedraggle conscience and all that is god-like in man, the problems are few and easily solved. The grim justice meted out, in such a low estate, forbids the rise of vexing and heart-lifting problems. Whenever the tide of life rises, the national ideals begin to glow with the starlight of heaven, and men are bounding towards the sunlit hills of everlasting glory, with problems of god-like proportion and import buzzing about them like bees. The recognition of these problems puts us half way towards their solution. Their solution for the glory of the kingdom and the welfare of humanity are certain, because of the religious life in America. That shrewd observer of American institutions, James Bryce, says: "Christianity is in fact understood to be, though not the legally established religion, yet the national religion. So far from thinking their commonwealth godless, the Americans conceive that the religious character of a government consists in nothing but the religious belief of the individual citizen, and the conformity of their conduct to that belief. They deem the general acceptance of Christianity to be one of the main sources of their national prosperity and their nation a special object of divine favor."

Remembering then that we are only in the midst of every problem that makes for the welfare of human kind, and that we have scarcely begun to work upon these problems, we have great reason to thank God and take courage at the progress that we have made. By the help of the Eternal we will solve

them. We are working at them with a confidence begotten from the assurance that we are on God's side. President Lincoln was once asked, Do you think that God is on our side? The great president with that supreme wisdom that served him so well said we should be far more concerned to know whether we are on God's side. Since the confidence that our nation is a part of the universal plan of God grows in intensity, there arises a confidence that will bestir all the patriotism of which the soul is capable. We will go forward feeling that we are about the Father's business. There are problems approaching with proportions that are as sublime as the largest stars that bedeck our evening sky. But from what we have done, we are sure that we are able to do even greater things. American Christianity forbids us to doubt. There has been such a constant succession of triumphs, with such a limited number of failures, that there is no manner of doubt about the ultimate success. The tide in the affairs of the nation has arisen, and we have taken it at its grandest flow. We have made the decision to be on the side of God.

And truth is truth as God is God.
And truth the day will win;
To doubt would be disloyalty,
To falter would be sin.

The hope of the final victory, when the powers of darkness will be routed, and righteousness cover the earth as the waters do the channels of the great deep grows brighter. If some Black Friday, now and then, shall dare to throw its foul shadows, when it seems as though the purposes of a divine providence were hesitating, and the world staying in its march to the brighter goal America shall cry—clouds and darkness are round about Him but righteousness and judgment are the habitation of His throne. The millennial dawn is nearer because of what religion in American life has been enabled to do. The kingdoms of this world are more confidently palpitating with the instincts of divine paternity because of what religion incarnated in political and national life

has accomplished. The pathway to the palace of the King is smoother and plainer because of the heavenward direction that American Christianity gives to the consecrated energies of the nation and the church.

O Star of Empire, stay thee on thy westward way! Here linger that thou mayest receive from generations yet unborn expressions of gratitude vieing with the surf thunders of song that roll and reverberate around the throne, since thou didst guide their fathers to Immanuel's land.

O star of Bethlehem, who hast guided our fathers so safely through perils of the heathen and perils of false brethren, through perils of failure and perils of success, through perils of poverty and perils of wealth, let thy healing beams fall upon the pathway along which their sons and daughters must journey. Fill us with such abounding ideas of personal responsibility to God and man, that we can give no sleep to our eyes or slumber to our eyelids, till the God of Jacob shall be enthroned in the hearts of the brave and free. Help us to realize that except the Lord build the house they labor in vain that build it, except the Lord keep the city the watchman waketh but in vain. Give us broader ideas of the mollifying and regenerating influence of the word of the Lord. Shine with a brightness above that of the sun in his midday splendor, so that no hand dare be lifted against this ark of God. Lead us in that processional of joy and singing which shall grow louder and clearer and sweeter till it shall lose itself in that heavenly chorus which ascribes honor and glory and dominion and power unto Him that sitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb for ever and ever.

Sail on, O ship of state!
Sail on, O union strong and great;
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate.
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee, are all with thee.

III.

DEUTERONOMY AND THE HAMMURABI CODE.

A. H. GODBEY, A.M.

In the first fever of interest aroused by the discovery of the Hammurabi Code, it was hoped that it would throw much light upon the Deuteronomic reform. So far, the results of comparison seen purely negative. Nothing really decisive has been attained. We are not able to declare with finality what Deuteronomy is, or what it is not.

The methods of comparison used are chiefly to blame for this lack of result. Isolated details have been examined, and a number of analogies noted. But this method is defective: for analogies can be discovered between any two considerable bodies of human law. Experience and inclination achieve many similar results in various lands, and among dissimilar peoples. Were analogies between Deuteronomy and Hammurabi twice as numerous as they are, the direct influence of Babylon upon Israel would not thereby be proven. It would still be possible that Deuteronomy represents a revulsion from Babylonian influence; an open attack upon Chaldea. The analogies might represent survivals of a time when both legal systems were closer together. This would involve then a study of the Covenant Code, and its relations to Deuteronomy and the Code of Hammurabi. Do any improvements upon the Covenant Code, apparent in Deuteronomy, represent Babylonian influences, or merely the natural advance in civilization, as influenced by prophetic teaching?

We should inquire also into the earliest known periods of each people. Were they once in contact, or practically one? If so, what common institutions should we most naturally expect to survive? What are the respective ideals: should we

look for parallel or divergent development? Does the Babylonian civilization offer the prophet anything that would enable him to realize his great dreams? Is the prophet to be considered as accepting or rejecting such supposed advantages? What allowance must be made for the traditional conservatism of the Hebrew?

Again, recognizing that Ur-Casdim was probably in southern Babylonia, are the analogies discovered as numerous as might be expected; especially when we remember that there was a renewal of contact, a long period of Assyrian influence, before the publication of Deuteronomy? Should the familiarity with Babylonian law appear to be very minute in the earliest periods of the Hebrew, and far less at a later day, despite the stubborn traditionalism of the Hebrew, we would be compelled to recognize that some very powerful influence, perhaps as yet unknown, had displaced Babylon in Hebrew tradition, and that Deuteronomy might be a declaration of war upon Babylon.

Since the early Hebrew-Aramean came from Ur-Casdim, we are warranted in examining Babylonian law to see if it is discoverable in the patriarchal period of the Hebrew. Conversely, if such influence be shown, we may decide against Kittel's theory that Ur-Casdim was in Armenia, in favor of Babylonia. An ordinary sympathy with the home of their ancestors might be expected to develop the Hebrew parallel with the Babylonian, provided the nation was sufficiently strong from the beginning to mould its own institutions. If he did not so develop; if the Babylonian institutions were lost as quickly as their Aramean speech, we may suspect their settled institutions came to be, in the main, as Canaanitish as their language. We know how Babylonian colonists settled in Samaria came to be in all essential features Jews. We have no good reason to suppose that the result was otherwise with the early Hebrew; especially when we find the prophets complaining that much evil is learned in Canaan. Thoroughly one-sided learning we may consider impossible. That much

evil was learned is explicable only upon the supposition that much was learned that was not evil.

A proper estimate of the relation of Deuteronomy and the Babylonian law then requires us to examine carefully the patriarchal period. We know that the Hebrew traditions make Abram emigrate apparently from southern Babylonia in the time of the first Babylonian dynasty, but we do not know the political causes of the migration. Aramean clans were scattered throughout this region, down to the founding of the Persian empire; and this may have been the first wave of the northward moving tide. Elam was dominant in the south at this time, and the migration may have been prompted by a hatred of Elam, or by Elamitic oppression. It is not impossible that in the fourteenth of Genesis we have Abram the Hebrew, and Lot, involved in the campaign because of an old grudge. At the same time we are told that a considerable portion of the clan remains in the vicinity of Harran. The inscriptions of Hammurabi show that his authority extended up the Euphrates valley to the sea. Harran and Aleppo are mentioned by him as places upon which he had spent much labor. We know he also had some authority in Martu, or *Mat Aharru* or *Amurru*, the "West land" or "Land of Amorites" as Palestine was called by the Babylonians; but it may not have extended to the southern frontier. In the succeeding reigns the control of Palestine seems to have been practically lost. We are warranted then in searching for Babylonian influences in Abraham's conduct, while in succeeding epochs we might expect a native of Palestine to be unfamiliar with the requirements of the Hammurabi Code.

The first point of contact with the Code we find in the fact that Abram has but one wife. We know polygamy was not uncommon in Israel, and among Canaanites and Hittites we find it within a comparatively short time after the removal to Palestine in the case of Esau. But in this first stage, we hear only of monogamy, whether Abram, Lot, or the Harran clan be mentioned. Even though his wife seems barren, polygamy

is not resorted to by Abram. This may be because of his adherence to the Babylonian law: for we know that the Code does not recognize barrenness as a cause for divorce, nor does it allow a man a second wife, save in the case the first is a chronic invalid (a leper?). But it allows a man a concubine in case the wife is barren, and does not present him her maid-servant. This latter we know Sarah did. But the Code also declares that such maid shall not take precedence of her mistress, under penalty of being reduced again to servitude. But she may not be sold if she have borne children. Her mistress can be rid of her only by giving her her freedom. The story of Hagar then is in harmony with the requirements of the Code in each detail.

Nothing can be made of the sacrifice of Isaac. Human sacrifice was not limited to any one branch of the Semitic race. We have contracts alluding to the possibility of a man sacrificing son or daughter as a burnt offering, from Assyria. We hear of it in Moab, in Canaan, in Phœnicia. The practice had no small hold upon the Hebrews. There is nothing essentially local about the story of Isaac.

Nor is there anything specifically Babylonian discernible about the marriage of Isaac to his cousin's daughter, or of Jacob to his cousin. We observe the primitive Arabian disposition to marry within the clan, which in Abraham's case resulted in the marriage with a half-sister. We have at present no Babylonian laws bearing upon the subject.

In the case of the purchase of the cave of Machpelah, we have processes of Babylonian commercial law minutely illustrated. The whole transaction is in the presence of witnesses; each detail is attested. It is evident, also, that there is not at this time the objection in Canaan to the sale of lands, which we hear of in the case of Naboth. But the most peculiar feature about this narrative is the regular use of the word *nathan*, "to give," in place of the verb "to sell." This is not ordinary Hebrew usage. We find it in Ez. 18: 13, Joel 4: 3, when Babylonian influence is prominent. But *nadanu* is the

regular word for "sell" in the Hammurabi Code. We must have then something more than a mere oral tradition in this narrative, else we should have had familiar Hebrew idioms. Nor can we attribute the use of the word to the mere influence of Babylonia in a later age, without showing why that influence did not displace Hebrew idiom in all other passages. We find reason to suspect that the purchase of the cave of Machpelah was governed by Babylonian law, and that written records or accounts of the transaction may have been transmitted. The whole form of the narrative, declaring what each person said, is parallel to the very full form of commercial document or judicial decision customary in Babylonia, as distinguished from the mere skeleton forms so frequent in Assyria.

The large responsibility and confidence which we observe in the case of Eliezer of Damascus is in harmony with the status of the so-called slave in Babylonia, and entirely unlike anything in ancient Israel, at any period known to us, and unlike all we know of primitive Arabian life. Eliezer manages all Abram's affairs, arranges a marriage for Isaac, and is spoken of as a possible heir in case Sarah bear no children. In Babylonia the slave can transact all kinds of business for his master, bring suit against him, acquire property, and marry a free wife; in which case the children are free and inherit one-half their parents' property. These features of his position are not parallel by the Covenant Code, nor yet by the Deuteronomic. There was marked retrogression in Israel in these particulars, from the initial Babylonian stage; and the Canaanite environment affords the most plausible explanation of the fact.

While we have then evidences that the influence of Babylonian law existed in the days of Abraham, soon dying out in the new home of the Aramean wanderers, we may feel sure that this law would be much more permanent in the Euphrates Valley; and a Palestinian in Harran a century after Abraham's migration to Canaan would find many laws with which

he was not perfectly familiar. A peculiar interest attaches to the narrative of Jacob and Laban, as it is the only patriarchal tale originating in the region governed by the Hammurabi Code. We may naturally conclude that every detail of the sharp practice narrated has important legal bearings, and that the narrative is to be studied in the light of the law of that land, with which Laban should be familiar; while Jacob, a stranger from Southern Palestine, should not be expected, at first, to know the law. As Jacob and Laban are kinsmen, it is not clan-law of which Jacob is ignorant, but the law of the land.

In the section of the Code of Hammurabi that deals with marriage and the various property interests involved, three distinct marriage settlements are repeatedly mentioned. The *tirhatu*, or betrothal present, is brought for the bride by the suitor, at the time of the betrothal contract (Code 159-161, et passim). The *šeriktu*, "gift," is the dowry bestowed upon the bride by her father, or her father's estate. The *nudunu* or "gift" is the marriage jointure, settled by the groom upon the bride. The various cuneiform contracts show that the two latter settlements may be made after the union of the young couple, from property acquired at a later period. But some sort of *tirhatu* seems to have been imperative; while a very poor man might evade the giving of a *šeriktu* to his daughter by treating the proffered *tirhatu* as a purchase price; but the daughter is then put in the position of a maid-servant instead of that of a bride.

In the Code (159-184), the proper disposal of these gifts in various contingencies is fully treated. The *tirhatu* is for the bride (section 163-164), not for her father. This is shown by the principle persistent in the provisions of the code, of compelling a wrong doer to pay a sum equal to the original amount involved in any given legal business transaction, to the injured party. In the cases where a man's wife is wronged by him in any way, the amount equal to the *tirhatu* is paid over to the wife herself, not to her father. It seems that the

latter, if he holds the *tirhatu*, does so merely in trust. It serves then as a species of bond for good behavior upon the part of the husband, and in case of divorce without just cause, the amount is doubled by the husband and paid over to the wife, as penalty for the man's infringement of the marriage contract (Code 138-139).

This presentation of a betrothal gift as a species of emergency fund or penal bond, is widely practiced in the Orient. We may observe it, for illustration, among the Mohammedan Malays at the present time. [Life in the Malay Peninsula, John Fairlie, *Century Magazine*, February, 1893.] If the bride's father break off negotiations after the acceptance of the *tirhatu*, or if he fail to keep his contracts, he forfeits the *tirhatu* with an equal sum to the groom. The *tirhatu* the bride's father may not lawfully appropriate, nor divert; the bride considers it a sort of reserve fund, or bank account. From it probably are drawn the gifts which a mother may make to her favorite child, as such disposal of the *šeriktu* and *nudunu* is not permitted her.

In the account of the marriage of Rebekah (Gen. XXIV.), we may see that such matters in the province of Haran seem to be controlled by Babylonian law. Rebekah is a free agent, her father probably being dead, as her mother and brother are the speakers; the Code of Hammurabi allows a virgin's brethren no absolute control in such matters. After the death of her father, or after a first marriage, the Code says of a woman, "The man of her heart shall take her." The gifts made by Abraham's steward, by way of formal betrothal present, are made to Rebekah herself (Gen. 24: 22). She makes the announcement to her family (Gen. 24: 28), and they are asked if they object to the marriage (Gen. 28: 49). Still further valuable gifts are made to Rebekah. She is clearly the recipient of the *tirhatu* in this transaction, and she evidently retains it in her possession when she leaves her home in Haran.

In the dowry and marriage jointure the wife has a life

interest. The former is intended for her own children, the latter for her husband's children. Children not hers may not share in the dowry; children not her husband's may not share in the jointure given by him. If she become a widow and wish to remarry, she resigns the jointure to her children by her first husband. Children of herself by both marriages share in her dowry equally at her death [Code H. 167, 172, 173, 174].

These details are important. All are in striking contrast with the poverty of the Pentateuchal Codes, which are totally without provision for the protection of a woman's property rights, and without adequate inheritance laws. On the other hand, the Hebrew parents have power of life and death over their children (Dt. 21: 18); a father may sell his daughter into perpetual servitude (Ex. 21: 6), he may take her from her husband and bestow upon another, as Saul did Michal. A woman may be divorced without just cause, and without penalty being imposed upon the husband (Deut. 24: 1; Ex. 21: 4; Mal. 2: 14), but there is no provision allowing her a divorce from a brutal husband. The rabbins later were compelled to deduce such right from the law protecting the maid-slave.* A woman is not a free agent unless a widow or divorced (Num. 30). There is marked retrogression from the Babylonian standards of the patriarchal age; and the fact is the more significant, when we consider that these social institutions are those we might expect to survive, if any did. Laws of rental, lease, boundary, traffic and agriculture might easily become obsolete as a result of a brief period of nomadic life. But some far more powerful influence is required to account for the disappearance of the fundamental social institutions under consideration. (Abraham is to be accounted a great cattle king like Hammurabi himself, or like Job or Mesha of Moab, who "was a sheep master"; hardly an ordinary nomad.)

We must now inquire, with regard to the *tirhatu*, if a mar-

* See "Jewish Law of Divorce," by David Werner Amram.

riage could be arranged without one, under Babylonian law, or if an equivalent could be proffered by a penniless suitor. The Code leaves us no doubt upon this point. In section 138 we are told that the wife unjustly divorced must be given by her husband a second sum, the equivalent of the original *tirhatu*. In 139, we learn that if he had not given, nor been able to give, such *tirhatu*, he shall pay to the divorced wife one mina of silver. That is to say, one mina of silver is named as the equivalent of the least *tirhatu* which should have been brought by the penniless suitor.

Now from the wage-scale (Section 273-274), we learn that the standard wage for a first class workman is 5 ŠE (grains of wheat?) of silver per day; that a skilful farmer or herdsman commanded this highest rate; skilled artisans being rated a little lower. As 180 ŠE make one shekel, and 60 shekels a mina; and since Professor Morris Jastrow has shown (*American Journal of Theology*, 1898) that the Babylonians observed a seventh day in some fashion, we readily recognize that one shekel means six weeks wages, and one mina 360 weeks, or exactly seven years (at the ordinary Semitic standard of 360 days to the year).

Seven years' service, then, is the alternative that a penniless suitor may offer as *tirhatu*, in lieu of cash or property, if he be a skilled laborer. If he is not such, his case may be even worse. It is apparent that this plan for the presentation of an equivalent of the *tirhatu* becomes an important factor in the constitution of the primitive clan. The majority of nomads are not skilled workmen, nor men of much property; and such may be bound to much longer terms of service for their wives. In like manner, penniless fellows, of no great executive ability, would prefer engaging for lengthy or perpetual service, merely to be assured of support and protection. Such men are not really slaves; they are not salable, even though the term *abd* or *wardu* may be applied to them. They are the voluntary dependents or clients of well-to-do householders. And this may be the class whose indigence

and incompetence are so frequently suggested in the Code of Hammurabi. Cf. Deut. 15: 17; Ex. 21: 16.

It is apparent also that a very interesting question with regard to the so-called matriarchate of the early Semite is raised by this method of securing a wife. In the lowest stages of tribal life, woman in all lands seems to be regarded as a chattel, to be secured by capture or purchase. We may fairly ask then if the matriarchate, in which a man abandoned his own clan and became a member of his wife's clan, forfeiting wife and children if he left it, was anything else than the application or development of this principle of working out the amount of what, in its primitive form, was merely the purchase price of a wife. Such development requires no other impulse than sharp bargaining on the part of the bride's kin. The reckoning of kinship through the mother would easily develop therefrom. We have this institution perpetuated in Exodus 21: 2-6; Dt. 15: 12-18; while such life-bargains seemed to be barred by the Babylonian law. We may observe the analogy between the three years period of service for debt in Babylonia or for hire in Palestine and the seven-year system of service for a wife in Babylonian, and as a slave in Palestine, with the final ideal of a Sabbatic year of release. Evidently these are traces of very early Semitic practices, somewhat differentiated locally. [Cf. Code Hammurabi 117; Dt. 15: 1, 18; Is. 16: 4; 21: 15; Ex. 21: 6, 8. Also acquiring land by three years' tenure, C. H. 44; Matt. 21: 33-38; and present Syrian custom.] A trace of the old law of forfeiting wife and children by forsaking the clan is to be observed in C. H. 136, when a deserting husband loses his wife "because he left his city."

Such service being proffered by a capable or penniless suitor instead of money or property, what has been said with regard to the purpose and disposal of the betrothal present in the more civilized stage of society will show that any net gain accruing from the seven years' service would be regarded by the bride as really her own, constituting her *tirhatu*,

misappropriation of which she would resent. It is but a step from the old wife purchase thus transformed, this more elevated ideal of woman's position, to the other extreme of husband-purchase, illustrated in cuneiform records, where a slave is bought as husband for the daughter of a family; the slave being formally freed and adopted as a son.

In the story of Jacob and Laban, the former, after a month's residence, proffers Laban the legal equivalent for a *tirhatu*. Rachel had perhaps explained this plan to him. It would appear that Laban never intended to carry out the agreement, since no contracts are drawn up, as the law requires; and Jacob is thus trapped through this seeming ignorance of local law. Laban had the law constructively in favor of his specious excuse. While not specifically enjoined, it is clearly expected (C. H. 66), that the marriage of older children shall be arranged first. The apparent failure to execute the required bonds, specifying which daughter shall be Jacob's bride recalls C. H. 128, which declares that if a man has betrothed or married a wife, and has not drawn up her bonds, that woman is no wife. Jacob is without legal claim to Rachel.

Jacob's bitter lesson from dependence upon a verbal agreement in a land whose laws made witnesses or bonds essential to the validity of all important transactions may have impelled him to a minute study of the law. We may conceive that he "fed fat the ancient grudge he bore" Laban, and was prepared to say, "it shall go hard but I shall better the instruction." Compare now Jacob's methods (Gen. 30: 30; 31: 12) and the quarrel scene (Gen. 31: 36 ff.) with the following section of the Code:

264. "If a herdsman to whom oxen or sheep have been given to pasture, receives his hire according to agreement, is satisfied, and allows the cattle or sheep to become enfeebled, or lessens the birth rate, according to his contracts he shall make good the birth rate and the increase."

265. If a herdsman, to whom oxen or sheep have been

given to pasture, has been dishonest, or has altered the terms (of his contract), or has sold them, they shall call him to account, and he shall restore to the owner oxen or sheep tenfold what he had stolen."

These sections, it will be observed, are not intended for the day-laborer, or hireling, but for the master-herdsman. Jacob is offered this latter position by Laban; and it will be observed that he so manipulates matters that he does not technically break the law, but induces Laban to do it. The latter changes the terms repeatedly, and Jacob has Laban's daughters as witnesses to the fact (Gen. 31: 6. 7). Had Jacob stipulated an annual salary, on the basis of a definite percentage of increase, he would be liable for damages for the diminishing and enfeebling of the flocks. But under the agreement made, he can prove this to be the result of Laban's contracts; and Laban, snatching at the enormous profits of his master-herdsman, is lured to his ruin.

Laban's daughters are smarting under a sense of wrong. Their father's avarice had put them in an equivocal position. The original agreement with Jacob for the equivalent of a *tirhatu* had bound them to wifely duties; but the proceeds being appropriated by Laban they were put in the position of having been sold instead of married, and sold to a foreigner, at that; contrary to the provisions of the code. To put themselves in the position of legal wives, it would be necessary to recover the misappropriated *tirhatu*. We may understand their approval of Jacob's scheme for helping himself where the law could not help him; and when the black looks of their outwitted kin (Gen. 31: 1, 2) warn them that the end is at hand, Rachel, the ancient Jessica, plans the final stroke.

This we may comprehend from the Code. In section 6 we read that whoever steals the property, or household furnishings, of a god, shall be put to death, and whoever receives the stolen goods shall be put to death. Such equipments of the god include images and all manner of votive objects.

The law was capable of broad interpretation, as Babylonian Jews in the later times understood perfectly. It could be made a means of according to property as well as to person the right of sanctuary, and was so used for fraudulent purposes. Christ alludes to it (Mark 7: 11), in his reference to "Corban," "dedicated"—made an excuse by wealthy sons for not aiding a needy parent. In earlier times it was less abused. Family silver or jewelry could be made into sacred or dedicated objects, and thus be brought within the protection of the sanctuary. Perhaps we have such a design in view in Judges 17: 3, where Micah's mother had dedicated a large quantity of silver to Yahweh. Learning this, and terrified by the terrible curses launched against the thief, Micah hastened to restore the plunder.

We may understand then that the "images" of Laban comprised miscellaneous votive offerings, and that they may have represented the bulk of the "family plate" and jewelry. Laban had appropriated Rachel's *tirhatu*, the proceeds of Jacob's seven years' labor, and had apparently given no dowry. Thus Rachel is, in the eyes of the people, as a slave sold to a stranger, or as an unportioned concubine whose brothers must legalize her marriage with proper bonds and endowment (C. H. 184). And she knew no relief from the indignity of her position could be expected from her brothers.

The feelings of Laban, when he learns that his cunning and beautiful youngest daughter has outwitted him, and that the fugitives have a week the start in the race for the Jordan, have an excellent modern presentation in the outcry of Shylock over the flight of Jessica. But little reflection would be required to convince the old man that no legal action would recover the herds, and recriminations would not mend matters. He discovers religious scruples upon these points, but does not hesitate to bring forward his capital charge.

Jacob, as well as Laban, knew that the latter had no legal recourse in the other matters because of failure to meet the requirements of the law. Of the capital offense charged by

Laban he knows nothing, and he orders the necessary search, saying, "Let him not live." He had anticipated some sort of violence upon Laban's part, feeling that the old man was perfectly capable of removing his daughters by force, since they were technically not married. Laban's own peril, in the dramatic denouement may be understood from the rigid application of the *lex talionis* in the Code. Section 1st declares that if a man charge a capital crime upon another, and fail to prove it, he shall be put to death.

We cannot stop to recount the final dramatic scene, in which Jacob turns upon his defeated accuser, reviewing the chicanery of the past. Laban's life is legally forfeit, and the fines to which he is liable would bankrupt the Aramean clan. Jacob adds a new item to the indictment. The Code declares that a shepherd shall not be held responsible if wild beasts destroy his employer's cattle. Yet Jacob claims that he at first voluntarily bore these losses, and that Laban later actually required it, contrary to law. It will be observed that Laban is anxious that a treaty shall be made barring all further procedure in the case.

But this plea for a treaty, made by the man who a little before had been boasting of his power to do hurt to Jacob, involves another point of contact with the Code. Under its provisions, a man could not marry two wives, unless the first were a chronic invalid. But for the imperfect title of Leah to the rank of wife, or her weak eyes (surgery upon the eye is discussed in the Code 215-220), the way to Rachel would have been barred to Jacob by Laban's first fraud. Neither as wife, maid-servant or concubine, could she have come to him under the law (C. H. 144). It may be that Laban had not intended giving Rachel to Jacob upon any terms at first; but seven years' active service showed Laban that he had a valuable master-herdsman, whom it might be well to retain at his own terms. So Leah's bad eyes could be made a pretext for availing himself of the convenient section 148 of the Code. But at the witness cairn of Gilead, the frontier

is near. Across the border the Code cannot reach, and other social standards prevail. That his daughters may not be mistreated, that Jacob shall take no other wives, Laban has recourse to adjuration.

Already suggestions have been made as to the resemblance of this tale to the story of Shylock. It is an interesting theme for the student of comparative folk-lore. We may have here the original of that much varied, far-travelled tale, one version of which Shakespeare has utilized in his "Merchant of Venice." We have not Shakespeare's *finale*. There is none to tell us of the hour of Rachel's revealing to Jacob who it was that put the decisive weapon in his hands, daring the peril alone. But we may comprehend more perfectly the immortal grief of the dying patriarch for the darling lost some fifty years before (Gen. 48: 7).

A critical conclusion seems warranted here. It is the general tendency of mere folk-tales to assume a local coloring, and to recast ancient events in the mould of contemporary institutions. Since the dealings of Jacob and Laban seem influenced by Babylonian law, we must suspect that there is much more than a mere folk-tale, picked up by JE, in this narrative. We should not expect the Babylonian law to so color the story after 1,200 years of oral tradition. We may feel less incertitude about the character of these patriarchal narratives. If the study leads us to conclude that we have minute and accurate portraitures from some contemporary source, archæology will have rendered a new service in the refutation of purely subjective criticism.

It is immaterial what date be assigned to the compilation of JE. The inference just indicated becomes the more plausible the later we suppose the collection to have taken place; since then the chances for losing original local coloring are increased. What remains in any case is the fact that the compiler has given us a story which does not harmonize with Palestinian law at any known point; and that he recognizes that different laws were in the regions occupied re-

spectively by Isaac and Laban, though they were members of the same family. Mere clan-law then can not explain the narratives. Nor do we know of nomadic law that will harmonize with the details. Babylonian law, applied in the Babylonian province of Harra, among emigrants from southern Babylonia, affords the natural explanation.

Again, in the account of the marriage of Rebekah there is a passage which suggests that the compiler was perplexed by the non-Palestinian character of the transaction. The steward deals with Rebekah as a free agent, not subject to her father's disposal, though he asks after her father's house (Gen. 24: 23). The damsel informs "her mother's house"—not her father's—her brother, not her father, comes forth to act as host (Gen. 24: 29-33). The brother and the mother appear again and again in verses 53-60. The maiden receives the important gifts. The compiler, perplexed by these things, apparently seeks to harmonize them with Hebrew properties by introducing Bethuel, the father in verse 50; but curiously enough puts him after Laban, suggesting thus an interpolation. The probability is emphasized that the narrative is not a mere clan legend, and is substantially correct. The practical independence of Rebekah, while guarded by her brothers, harmonizes with the Hammurabi Code, or with the apparent status of the Shulamite in Canticles, after Israel has learned from Babylon. But it finds no parallel in Hebrew Codes or practice. (Woman's position may have been higher among the northern Josephites than in Edomite Judah.)

Again, if the Hebrew emigrant came from a land where this code had developed from the written decisions of centuries; where it was set up in the temples and courts, that all might know their rights; if we recognize in Harra at this time but a province of the empire, we have reason to question if a minute knowledge of the Code would be possible to the illiterate. The assumption that writing was entirely unknown to the earliest Hebrews has much against it. And

if the points already mentioned suggest that there must have been documentary transmission of the narratives considered, there remains no reason why there should not have been local records of the events in Gen. XIV., which involve Hammurabi.

Since the heap of witness is represented both here and in the narrative in Joshua to be at the boundary between two distinct regions, with different civil codes and different religious institutions, we may doubt if any of the earlier Hebrew codes were operant in the Israelitish territory beyond Jordan. We have strong grounds for suspecting them to be purely Palestinian, essentially Canaanitish, in their chief civil and social features. Very remarkable is the absence of all provision for the problems certain to arise among great herders of cattle, such as the eastern Israelites were represented to be. Could Babylonian law have survived east of the Jordan?

Subsequent to the Laban episode, we have probable traces of the Babylonian law. The disinheritance of Reuben is in accordance with the provisions of the Code for such offense. In Reuben's case, sentence is at once passed by his father, in an excommunicative curse. The Code contemplates that such a matter shall be brought before a judge. But the Hebrews were not then resident within the jurisdiction of a competent court. We may wonder if remoteness from regular judicial centers was not a prominent factor in the large development of the use of the ban or curse.

The Babylonian law that provided for the death of a man's son if the man had caused the death of another's son may have a reminiscence in Reuben's offering his two sons as security for the safe return of Benjamin and Simeon. As the Babylonian law provides for the death of one who steals and sells a minor, this may be reflected in the great fear of Joseph's brethren when they learn his identity, and later, when his father died. For so long as these early Hebrews were not fully assimilated to Canaanite institutions, their

conceptions of law would be determined mainly by memories of those institutions under which their youth was spent.

Again, we must observe the peculiar land system which Joseph introduced into Egypt, among the masses. The government became the principal landholder, absorbing also the work-oxen, seed and tools. The peasant thereafter had necessarily to farm in partnership with the government, the latter furnishing everything, and giving the peasant a share in return for his work. But the lands and revenues of the great temples were not so absorbed; Joseph marrying into one of the great priestly colleges. But these features are characteristic of the Babylonian institutions under which Joseph spent his youth. One of the most important officers, whose functions are described in the Code (253-256), is called a *Kêpu*. His work is what has just been described; the supplying government land and equipment for one half the crop, to such as were too poor to own land or to pay cash rent. More interesting still, this functionary is commonly indicated by an ideogram which means, "the preserver of life"; and Joseph declares that he was sent into Egypt as "the preserver of life," while the name given him, Zaphnath-paaneah, is generally recognized by Egyptologists to contain some such meaning.

When the sacred divining cup is believed to be stolen, Joseph's brethren apparently think such crime involves the death-penalty, as it would in Babylonia; but Joseph, speaking as an Egyptian official, seems to declare that Egyptian law merely reduces the offender to servitude. Neither seems to have been Canaanitish or early Israelitish law, at the time of the doings of Micah, as recorded in the book of Judges.

The patriarchal narratives, thus studied in the light of the Code, gain much in interest, and enable us to be somewhat more certain as to the character and trend of Hebrew development. We have noted between thirty and forty points of contact with the Babylonian law and which are not duplicated in the formal Hebrew Codes; more analogies than exist in all the

remaining preexilic history of the Hebrews. An equal number of social institutions, which mere nomadic life should not have effaced, have totally disappeared. Comparisons already published serve to show differences, divergence rather than similarity. The inference is legitimate that bondage and nomadic habits followed by Canaanite life and law soon drew the Hebrew away from better institutions familiar in his earlier Babylonian days, and that even Babylonian sovereignty in Palestine at a later day was not sufficient to restore some important elements of law and organization that had long been lost.

This view is strengthened by the fact that Deuteronomy is unique in its literary plan, distinct from all other Hebrew compositions. Its main lines of construction are identical with those of the Hammurabi Code. Each begins with a historical prologue, recounting the great events of the past; each passes on to declare that a great body of law was then divinely given, to establish justice and mercy, that the strong might not oppress the weak. Hammurabi would be remembered as "King of Righteousness"; the great Deuteronomic prophet would impress upon his hearers, "And this is the name whereby he shall be called: The Lord Our Righteousness"! Hammurabi and Jahweh are alike "Faithful Shepherds" and each code is followed by a series of blessings upon those who shall keep the law, and of curses upon those who disregard it. The literary effect of the subservience to Assyria that began in the days of Ahaz seems unmistakable; but this only emphasizes the real divergence. In the case of the Hammurabi Code, we may feel sure that it is a compilation of judicial decisions. We have the same impression produced by the "Book of Decisions" which is included in the Book of the Covenant. But in Deuteronomy every one will recognize not the lawyer but the preacher, not the Hebrew judge or legislator but the Hebrew prophet.

More pronounced grows the divergence when we consider the actual contents of the Deuteronomic Code, in the light of

the persistent prophetic emphasis upon the needs of the time. These may be summed up under three heads: (1) The reform and organization of religious institutions; (2) the betterment of the social system, in the interests of the poor; (3) the reform of the judiciary.

In regard to the first point, it may be observed that the priesthood of Babylonia was minutely subdivided and most thoroughly organized. Perhaps no better working organization ever existed. Yet not a trace of this, or of anything even approximately resembling it, can we fairly demonstrate in Deuteronomy. This is the more significant when we remember how large is the seeming Babylonian element in the later Levitical Code. We may recognize in Deuteronomy the effort to meet a dangerous foe, which we know to have been well organized; yet this effort, so far from being a copy of the foe's organization, seems rather designed to remove those agencies which could be most readily utilized by the enemy. An effort to adopt the best principles of Babylonian law would also not have overlooked the systematic provision, in Babylonia, for the maintenance of the temple services, by means of annual revenues, derived from the royal treasury and from the temple lands. There is no fixed annual revenue for the maintenance of the temple at Jerusalem before the days of Nehemiah. Nor have the Levites such fixed possessions, ample for the whole order, as may be compared with the Babylonian temple lands, in any early period of Hebrew history. Ezekiel's copy of the Babylonian temple land system, Ezek. 45: 1-8, was never adopted. It is clear that from Micah to the Deuteronomic period the Levite is largely dependent upon such offerings as the people may choose to give; he is the mendicant friar of his time. Voluntary offerings for the maintenance of religion are an important part of the temple revenues in Babylonia; but they merely supplement a wise minimum provision, from the annual receipts of the government, for the support of the religious classes. Liberality even goes further in Babylonia, for we find records of

gifts of land to the temples, donations made by private parties. It is probable that the immense land-holdings of the temples had been slowly acquired in this way. We know of a similar state of affairs in Egypt, just as we know that mediæval piety eventually made the monasteries and abbeys of Europe immensely wealthy. Yet we have no account of any such tendency in Palestine. The Babylonian temple treasury becomes a great banking concern, an invaluable *mont de Piété*, it would seem.

Not merely is there a failure to adopt any of these measures which were so much needed by the Hebrew social system, but the prohibitory religious legislation of Deuteronomy seems especially directed against Babylonia. The prophetic warnings are chiefly against the observing of times—lucky and unlucky days; the worship of the sun and moon and the host of heaven. The dreamer of dreams, and the prophet who is able to give a sign or wonder that will certainly come to pass, are treated with much fullness. Jeremiah is equally emphatic in urging the people not to follow after the heathen, nor to be dismayed at their '*ôthôth* in heaven. The day of the '*ôth* is past; a radical change since the days when Isaiah was ready to meet the Babylonian astrologer upon his own grounds and offer an '*ôth* in the heavens above, or in the earth beneath. These great prohibitory features of the Torah have no parallel in the earlier legislation; and hence are more intelligible if understood to deal with Babylonian astrology, that began to permeate Israelitish life during the reign of Ahaz.

As to the social system, and the condition of the poor, we know how intense was the prophetic feeling upon this subject. Yet Deuteronomy does not seem to contain a single practical legislative reform, despite the great length of its preaching of humanity. We have already noticed the *Kêpu* system of Babylonia, which aided the indigent without rendering them dangerous vagrants, supported in idleness, like the rabble of imperial Rome. But in Israel the poor man

might be sold for a pair of shoes, be made to serve seven years, and if he secured his liberty then, his getting a small present depended entirely upon the liberality of the master who had already taken such unfair advantage of him. There was no *Kêpu* of whom he might obtain land and seed and tools upon shares, to start anew in life. Aristocrats were absorbing the land, joining house to house and field to field. But the poor man in Babylonia could not be sold out for a pair of shoes. Nothing more than his actual debt could be collected from him. No advantage could be taken of his necessities. If any part of his crop was taken for his debts, it was estimated at the King's price, and any balance above the debt was returned to the poor debtor. Nor could his crop, in field or store, be seized without his consent. His working stock was exempt; his family also. A closed account could not be reopened; a freed debtor could not be again seized, as were the poor Hebrews whose reenslavement so infuriated Jeremiah.

The Hebrew prophet denounced interest; which only meant, practically, to diminish the poor man's opportunities of borrowing; it shows again the rather impractical nature of the prophetic reformer. So poor were the laws that either borrower or lender might be roundly cursed, as tricksters. But the Babylonian Code more wisely divided the risks. If there was a failure of the crops when the tenant or debtor was obliged to pay cash rent or interest, his time was extended one year, and no interest could be charged for the year the crops failed. If he rented a field on shares, his landlord shared the risk of lost crop. Similar was the case with the petty merchant or peddler, operating for some large firm. Risks were divided. The condition of the Babylonian slave or servant was in like manner far superior to that of the Hebrew slave. But these principles of mercantile equity have not been adopted by the prophet, though for about three centuries mercantile interests have been developing among the Hebrews.

Notoriously deficient in legislation defining the property rights of women is the Hebrew Code, as we have noticed above. The widow and the fatherless and the Levite and the poor of the land are classed together as objects of charity. A very little specific statement of property rights would have simplified the situation that so troubled the prophets, but we find none. In two cases we know that widows in financial distress came to Elisha the prophet; evidently there was no local court or law to which they could appeal. Elisha uses his personal influence with the king in one case, works a miracle in the other. Neither case could have occurred under Babylonian institutions. Things were certainly in bad condition in Palestine when miracles had to supplement defective legislation. And we know that in later times, when the influence of life in Babylon had improved the Jewish woman's position, the scribes were compelled to deduce a wife's right to divorce from the law primarily designed to protect the slave. (See Amram, *Jewish Law of Divorce*.)

The third point of the continuous prophetic complaint, the state of the judiciary, again shows no trace of the Babylonian system. The latter is highly organized, it has inferior and superior courts, it has appeals and changes of venue, it has a bench of seven judges, who are promoted according to merit and time of service, as in the Chinese civil system of to-day; it carefully examines all testimony, it demands written documents in every case when they are possible, it files its records and reports of cases, as well as all transfers of property and all deeds and contracts. Such is the system of checks, the possibility of appeal and revision, such the legislation against fraud and incompetency of the judges, or needless litigation, that the possibilities of injustice were reduced to a minimum, so far as organization could do it. Of all this highly finished system there is not a trace in Deuteronomic Israel.

In a few passages of Deuteronomy, which are parallel to the Covenant Code, we find a more humane spirit, and a slight modification of the earlier law. But there seems no

necessity for insisting that these alterations are explicable only by the influence of Babylonia. The large *attendrissement* of prophetic preaching and spirit, which sets in with the rebuke of Elijah at Horeb, and which is so largely in evidence in Hosea, is not only ample to account for the legislative advance which is recognizable, but also leaves us wondering why it is not much greater. Certainly we cannot attribute Hosea's tenderness to Babylonian influences. The experiences of Palestine under Assyrian domination during the dark days of Manasseh were of the harshest kind; and the glimpses given us of that period, in the prophetic writings, do not tend to produce the impression that the more humane sentiments would be evoked by familiarization with Assyria.

Deuteronomy then, with all its humane impulses, its lofty ideals, its ardent desire for better things, its strong and persistent appeals to the moral sense of the Hebrew, must stand in some sense as the record of prophetic failure. It emphasizes the fatal incapacity of the Hebrew for sound political or social organization. For two thousand years he has wandered from kingdom to kingdom; he has never gone out into the wilderness and carved out a new state. It has been his destiny to play in the Semitic world precisely the part played by the Greek in the ancient Aryan world; to furnish the highest ideals of his own race, which other peoples should mould into organic form for the uplifting of the world. The very points at which the prophets most felt the need of methodical reform—the organization and support of religious institutions, the condition of the poorer classes, the state of the judiciary—are precisely the points at which most could have been learned from Babylonia; and Deuteronomy records the fact that they did not learn. The prophetic protest against certain elements of Babylonian religion failed to take into account other things of the first importance for the rectification of political and social inequalities, which Babylon was destined to teach. But one man, Ezekiel, was great enough to rise above national prej-

udices and to endeavor to give his people the excellencies of Babylonian organization; his code is in contact with it at point after point. But it never was in force.

It may be conjectured that the prophet saw and appreciated the excellencies of Babylonian organization, but knew no way to adopt them without yielding to the Babylonian religion; for Semitic law seems indissolubly linked with Semitic faith. To this it may be said that we should at least expect counter-organization, if such were their position. But we have in Deuteronomy preeminently a book without organization of methodical institutions. The prophetic ideal was too narrow, because too national, as was also the Greek. The contemptuous epithets *Barbaroi* and *Goyim* applied to all not belonging to the respective nations illustrate perfectly the limitations of each of the two great teaching peoples. And so the most intelligent of the Hebrew nation of the Deuteronomic age were returned to the home of their ancestors of sixteen centuries before, that the really valuable features of the highly organized culture of Babylonia might be appreciated, and in some measure assimilated. Yet even then but one man was great enough to rise above national prejudices, to perceive the real excellencies of Babylonian society, to cast aside all pretense of speaking in the name of Moses, and to endeavor to construct a new organization embodying Babylonian excellencies. It was a failure. "Thus saith Moses" was more than "thus saith Yahweh" with the "rebellious house," as the Deuteronomic reformers well knew. Ezekiel's code was never adopted. But many fragments of Babylonian institutions in time undesignedly found their way into the life of the Hebrew. The Talmud is interesting as showing that the Jew learned much about civil law and legal procedure, though he rejected Ezekiel's systematic copy of Babylonian institutions, and endeavored to deduce the principles of his new learning from his old law, as the Mohammedan judge may interpret the Koran to accord with the Code Napoleon, or as Christian apologetes may twist the Hebrew

writings into harmony with the latest discoveries of science. Likewise the Jewish ritualist learned much and wholly reorganized his institutions, though he represents these modifications as belonging to his own earlier history, being all unconscious of the fact that he had learned. Perhaps Nehemiah may have grasped the idea that Babylon had a great mission to Israel when he reproved his coadjutors for oppressive exactions from their poorer countrymen, and declared that because of such things their forefathers had been sent to Babylonia. It is not far-fetched to suppose that he recognized better conditions to be existent in the latter country.

We are but beginning to realize "the beauty of the Chaldee's excellency," as a seat of law and justice, which was not denounced by the prophets, like Nineveh, as a "bloody city, full of lies and robbery." Without its lessons in ecclesiastical organization Judaism must have gone down before Hellenism. Babylon has contributed to the religious organization of the world.

IV.

RELIGIOUS PROPHECY AMONG THE GREEKS.

I. INTRODUCTORY: THE SCIENCE OF RELIGION, THE STUDY OF GREEK RELIGION, THE BEGINNINGS OF GREEK RELIGION, HOMER.

BY N. P. VLACHOS, PH.D.

The study of Greek religion, on a truly scientific basis, dates only from comparatively recent years. When F. A. Wolff placed the *Alterthumswissenschaft* on a secure footing now more than a century ago, finally divorcing it from theology, with which it had been commonly affiliated, he assigned to mythology and the history of Greek religion its place among the various departments which the new science was to embrace; but the time had not yet come for the cultivation of this field of learning. It is only the last three decades that have been more fruitful of solid results, and still greater promises are held out for the future. Archaeology and anthropology have added to our available material and have widened our vision; they have compelled classical philologists to abandon theories long regarded as firmly established, and to readjust their views in conformity to the wealth of facts brought to light by the researches of scholars in other than purely "classical" fields. For the one thing, which it was absolutely essential to recognize, was that the study of religious phenomena among one people cannot be profitably pursued without constant reference to kindred phenomena among other peoples, and that the narrow specialist, however learned, can never hope to put the right interpretation on the facts he has observed, if he do not extend his horizon, and acquaint himself with the labors of others in fields not strictly his own.

When this was once understood, and all that it implied—in other words, when it was realized *that there is a unity underlying the various manifestations of religious consciousness among all peoples and in all ages*, the time had come for the founding of a new science: the science of religion.

Before entering upon our subject proper, it may be well to devote a few pages to a discussion of what we understand by this term.

The term "science of religion" was first used by Max Müller, the pioneer in this field, in his book "Introduction to the Science of Religion" (1873). The term may well sound strange to some ears, or even self-contradictory and paradoxical. For is not religion concerned with the supernatural and the transcendental? And what science would ever be capable to define, analyze or explain the supernatural and the transcendental? Indeed, many scholars have hesitated to adopt the expression, preferring to speak more modestly of a "history of religion." Now, the word "science" would certainly be presumptuous and misleading, if this new science really aimed at establishing the truth about the transcendental and if it intended to finally solve the problem whether religion is a hallucination or not. The object of the science of religion, however, is a far more modest one. It sets itself to study religion purely and simply as *a historical phenomenon in the life of man*, exactly as the science of philology studies the art of speech; and that, without any ulterior motives but those of any science, and, therefore, without affiliating itself to any special religious system: herein lies the fundamental difference between theology and the science of religion.

Its method is the *historical* method, which chiefly consists "in the endeavour to treat facts in connection with the conditions under which they are produced and likewise to trace the origin of religious phenomena to the conditions appropriate for their production."*

* Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., "The Study of Religion," p. 21.

special divine dispensation, of revelation and the like is not denied; we cheerfully admit the limits of our knowledge; at the same time all factors of a supernatural order must be rigidly excluded from the domain of our science. For a surrender in that direction is virtually equivalent to confessing that the problem under consideration does not admit of a solution in the true sense of the word: the moment the supernatural factor is admitted as a potent cause, the limits of our science are transgressed.

But the science of religion, while naturally sceptical and conservative, approaches all religions in a spirit of sympathy; he whose life has been without any religious experience is obviously unfit to make religious phenomena a subject of research, just as he whose ear cannot perceive the harmony of sound, is not qualified to serve as a guide in the field of music. Again, the individual investigator must be without bias or preconceived notions. He must keep his mind free alike from the intolerant attitude, characteristic of so many thinkers of the past (Luther himself included) whose religious fanaticism prevented them from approaching the study of religion in the proper frame of mind, and from the superficial cynicism and hostility, displayed by certain English and French writers of the eighteenth century, who discovered in the cunning personality of the priest the source of all religious institutions! Far from being prejudiced in either direction, the student must patiently accumulate facts, classify them, account for them, if possible, and trace the process of evolution down from the highest forms, which are easiest to interpret, to the lowest and simplest elements, to the germ out of which the whole system grew. And in interpreting the facts, coming within his observation, he should constantly have reference to analogous phenomena in other religions, even if actual intercourse between the nations considered is wholly out of the question; this is the comparative treatment of religious phenomena.*

* For an illustration of this method I may cite Andrew Lang's interpretation of the myth of Kronos in "Custom and Myth."

To resume: the subject of the science of religion is religion as a historical phenomenon in the life of man; its method is the historical method; and tacitly assuming that there is a unitary principle underlying the multiplicity of religious phenomena, it attempts to shed light on their meaning by constant comparison.*

But, it will be objected, does not the comparative treatment virtually place all religions on an equal footing? Does it not imply that all religions are alike and of equal value? We answer: it is true, our science does not make at the outset a distinction between "true" and "false" religions; indeed, it is not its object to prove any religion "true" or "false." At the same time it neither holds that all religions are alike; for if they were, there were no need of comparing them.

Again it will be said, this procedure of tracing backward the higher manifestations of religious consciousness to the lower ones, coupled with the supposition that all religions have passed through a similar evolutionary process, will possibly end in discovering in some absurd superstition the beginning of religion. And now, if this superstition is a manifest hallucination, would that not involve the further conclusion that all religion is a hallucination? It must be admitted that in our quest for an origin we may finally be compelled to find the beginnings of religion in some fallacy or other. And, indeed, Professor Tylor thus found the origin of religion in animism, Spencer in the belief in ghosts. But, even if these theories were true, that would not by any means warrant us to conclude that religion, because beginning with a hallucination, is nothing but a hallucination. For "the phenomena of the beginning of a life are not to be regarded as the *causes* of the phenomena that follow; but the former are imperfect manifestations of a principle which is more completely manifested in the latter."† It is not *because* primitive man once

* Cp. the admirable paper of F. B. Jevons, "History and Method of the Science of Religion," *International Monthly*, III. (1901), pp. 464-494, 550-569.

† Edw. Caird, "Evolution of Religion," I., p. 48.

believed in a spirit dwelling in a certain tree or stone, that an enlightened humanity now believes in the Fatherhood of God. Religion, as Tiele well observed,* begins with an *emotion*; to prove the falsity of religion, it would be necessary to prove the delusive character of religious emotion; but the science of religion, nor any science, for that matter, can ever furnish that proof. The testimony of physical science may be adverse to a particular religious *conception*; it may, for instance, upset the belief in a sun-god, driving his fiery chariot through the skies; but in this case religion had encroached on the domain of science.

Finally, this question may have arisen in some reader's mind: does not the science of religion, being a historical science, and looking on religion as a thing essentially human, completely ignore the theological doctrine of a "primitive revelation"? It undoubtedly does. The hypothesis that the Divine Power at the beginning of man's existence in this planet revealed to him the essentials of religious truth, must be utterly rejected. Our science can no more accept this doctrine than philology could acquiesce in a theory that God first taught man the essentials of the art of speech. Anthropology has proven that man has lived for ages in a state of extreme barbarism: does it seem conceivable that man, while living in so gross materialism, should have been entrusted by an All-wise God with the keeping of the most precious truths he can possess? This theory is, moreover, directly contradicted by the evidence at our disposal; all analogy is completely lacking. The science of religion, however, is not bound to disprove the doctrine of the pristine revelation, before proceeding to treat religion as a thing essentially human, any more than physical science is under obligation to prove the mythical character of the creation-story as recorded in Genesis, before advancing its own theories. On the contrary, the burden of proof rests with the other side.

There is, indeed, one interpretation of the meaning of

* "Elements of the Science of Religion," II., p. 15.

"primitive revelation" which we are free to accept. A. Réville, in his *Prolegomena to the History of Religion*, E. T., p. 35, expresses himself thus: "If God has so constituted human nature that at some moment in its development it must awake to the recognition of a reality superior to purely sensible phenomena, and if this first awakening of the religious feeling must, in virtue of this same constitution of the human mind, lead it by a series of experiences, of reflections, of genial aspirations, to the notion of a Power Supreme and superlatively adorable, it is evident that this moment, august above all others, in which a human soul feels itself pervaded, as it were, by a spirit the existence of which it had not previously suspected, is the initial point of a development which must fill history. * * * The point of departure is fixed, and the journey begins. In substance, it comes to precisely the same thing to say, God revealed himself in the beginning to man, as soon as man had reached a certain stage in his psychic development; as to say, Man was so constituted, that, arrived at a certain stage in his psychic development he must become sensible of the reality of the Divine influence. In this sense, which leaves perfect freedom to history, we also could accept the idea of a primitive revelation." The present writer would go even further, and testify to his belief that the whole history of religion and its evolution is but the record of God's revelation to man, a revelation in accordance with man's capacity of understanding. But these are matters of *faith*, and not of knowledge.*

And now, after having cleared the ground and laid the foundations, we may proceed to the subject proper of this and the subsequent papers. Perhaps an apology is due to the

* Unless I am mistaken, the word revelation has acquired a different meaning also among theologians; as an indication, I may quote the words of a contributor to this periodical: "More and more the conviction has grown that in revelation God is aiming at life and character, not at the gratification of human curiosity." (Professor G. B. Stevens, in *REV. CH. REV.*, VII., 1902, p. 330.)

reader, who has been kept waiting so long; the writer did not, however, deem it superfluous to set forth as briefly as possible, his views concerning religion as a *subject of scientific investigation*, the standpoint of the majority of his readers toward religion being, presumably, of a different nature.

The study of Greek religion, then, as the entire science of religion, is still in its infancy; and that, in spite of the mass of books written on the subject. In many of the older writers a lack of sufficient breadth of vision is painfully apparent. Others again, either from their shallow positivist point of view, looked at religion as if it were a purely intellectual affair, or from their Christian point of view, looked at it through Christian spectacles; that is, either as "intellectuals," or as "Christians," they allowed a natural bias to interfere with their researches. As an instance of the former, the euhemeristic theory of the origin of (Greek) religion may be cited; as an instance of the latter K. F. Nägelsbach's book,* which is wholly planned and reared on Christian groundwork; it affords ample testimony to the sound moral sense of the German professor, but the defect from which it suffers is fatal to its usefulness, giving as it does, a fairly comprehensive but *distorted* view of Greek religion during the period which it treats. Similarly, the main thesis of F. G. Welcker's "*Griechische Götterlehre*,"† another standard work, which endeavors to reduce Greek polytheism to an original monotheism, characterises it as coming from the pen of a man of biased mind. Far, worse, however, were the perfectly unhistorical theories of a certain class of well-meaning but overzealous and indiscriminate writers who detected "*striking resemblances*" between Christian doctrine and Greek belief, or found everywhere in Greek religion traces of the primitive revelation.‡

Again, before the present era of anthropological and archæo-

* "*Nachhomerische Theologie*," Nurnberg, 1857.

† Bonn, 1863.

‡ So even Gladstone; cp., for instance, his "*Juventus Mundi*," pp. 202 f., 207 ff.

logical research, it was but too common to throw so great an emphasis on the mythological side of Greek religion as to make the terms mythology and religion almost synonymous, as far as the Greeks were concerned. Such undue importance attached to the intellectual side of religion was not inexcusable at a time when it was as yet not fully realized that to understand the nature and growth of a religion, the duty of the scholar does not consist solely in studying its creeds and doctrines. It is only natural to the modern mind to overlook the important fact that only as man's history grows older, his powers of reflection increase, and that, therefore, the further backward we go in the history of religion, the more the importance of the intellectual side of religion diminishes, and the more its emotional side predominates.

But to attempt even a hasty sketch of the history of the study of mythology and Greek religion,* would lead us too far afield. Let us rather recount what has been established by the investigations of scholars in regard to the beginnings of Greek religion,—that period which may be called the pre-Homeric. In doing so, we may avail ourselves of the admirable résumé given by Professor O. Kern.†

The Greek tribes, at the time of their first appearance on the historical horizon, were at a stage of civilization very much the same as that occupied at the present time by some negro races in the interior of Africa. Among these people, their religious customs, their ritual and their crude theology, we must look for an analogy and an explanation of what we observe among the Greeks. For the researches of archæology inaugurating with the epoch-making excavations conducted by Schliemann on the site of Troy and Mycenæ have brought

* I may refer the curious reader to O. Gruppe, "Griechische Kulte und Mythen," I., pp. 1-278. In the current number of the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, Usener, in an interesting paper, sets forth his interpretation of the term mythology, and states his views concerning the right method in dealing with mythological data.

† In a lecture: "Ueber die Anfänge der hellenischen Religion," Berlin, 1902.

to light a mass of material, proving conclusively that for many centuries before the advent of anthropomorphism, the Greeks worshipped the supernatural in other and cruder forms. They passed through the stages of animistic belief and fetishism; that is they worshipped inanimate subjects or rather the spirit dwelling in them, to which various powers of averting misfortune, curing sickness, etc., were attributed. In Greek literature we frequently meet references to what must be interpreted as survivals of the worship of stones; especially those of unusual shape seem to have quickened the imagination of the Greeks. Religious cults, as is well-known, are tenacious to an extraordinary degree, and remnants of a primitive stone-cult may be traced down to the age of imperial Rome. Stocks also received their share of worship; in these, too, a spirit was supposed to dwell. The crude, wooden idols, scrupulously preserved in the temples of prominent deities, and elsewhere, testify to this phase of belief. The tree itself was often regarded as the seat of a supernatural power;* and in the rustlings of its leaves the devout worshipper heard the voice of the deity.

Again, the worship of animals had its day of prominence.† Archaeological finds show amulets with the images of curious creatures, half men, half beast; epithets of the gods and their worship in the form of animals point in the same direction; and abundant evidence of a one-time worship of cow, wolf, owl, snake, etc., is furnished by the circumstance that in historic times we find these animals associated with the great

* In this connection it is of interest to know that philology has established the important fact that the Greek words for "temple" and "ship" go back to a single root; this seems to mean that the hollow trunk of the tree served both as dwelling to the god and as a boat.

† Professor Kern speaks of Totemism; but it is doubtful whether totemism proper (the essential features of which consist in belief in kinship between the animal deity and its worshippers and the desire for communion with the animal-god) ever flourished among the Greeks as a religious conception and practice. Frazer, the greatest authority on the subject, doubts the existence of totemism among the Indo-European races.

Greek deities. In this way the later and more refined cult absorbed the older elements which still survived among the less cultivated.

Finally the worship of the spirits of the dead and of the chthonic powers at one period predominated among the Greek tribes. It is the merit of E. Rohde to have laid bare the extent of this phase of Greek belief in all its ramifications.* The elaborate grave-cult, as still practised in historic times, and the magnificent bee-hive tombs, of pre-Homeric date, revealed by the spade of the archæologist, testify to the awe in which the Greeks held the soul that had passed away, and all connected with the netherworld.

In this cult, which really is homage paid to human beings, and in the belief in demons, of partly human, partly animal form, as centaurs, satyrs, etc., we detect the beginnings of anthropomorphism. Man begins to grow conscious of himself, of his superiority to the animal world. He claims himself the highest of natural beings and projecting his own personality into that mysterious aggregate of forces, that are beyond his control, he ends in completely humanizing that which he conceives to be the supernatural, that Great Power by which he seems hemmed in on all sides, and on which he feels himself dependent.

The crowning achievement in this process of humanization was wrought by Homer, the poet "whose men were mortal gods" and "whose gods were immortal men." But the Homeric poems made their appearance only at the end of this period. Its beginning is marked by the creation of purely local gods. Every tribe, every village set up its own deity, which it worshipped and to which it sacrificed. The fisherman had his special god, the hunter worships a divine huntress, the farmer prays to his deity, protector of his flocks. But a great distance separates these local gods, vague personalities from the Olympian pantheon, Zeus at its head, with which Homer has made us familiar; here is a gap which it

* *Psyche*, Tübingen u. Leipzig, 1893; 3d edition, 1903.

is difficult to bridge over. We would like to know what tribe it was, among which the conception of Zeus, the great deity of heaven, originated; but much that is doubtful in the history of Greek religion, is perhaps destined to remain doubtful forever. Polytheism itself cannot strictly be said to have existed among the Greeks before the various tribes emerged from their isolation, that is before the period of emigration, during which the Greek tribes, seeking new abodes came into closer contact with one another.

But the intense humanity of the gods of the Greek pantheon is the creation of one mind,—the poet to whom we may ascribe the bulk of the two great epics. It was he who made the Greeks rise above local cult and tribal worship to a *national* religion.

Shall we call him the first of the religious prophets among his people? Let us, however, first of all, make clear to ourselves what we understand by "religious prophet." To the average mind the expression may suggest the idea of a holy man, considered to be the mouth-piece of the deity, and whose specific task it is, therefore, to predict what the future has in store for his people. But this is only the narrowest interpretation of a term that has a far greater range of meaning. A more enlightened view of the religious movement crystallized in the personalities of a number of men of exalted aspirations and deep religiosity, among the Hebrews, has made us familiar with a broader interpretation of that term. Let us see what Réville has to say concerning prophetism. He finds in it "a reforming religious power," in contrast to "sacerdotalism, the tendencies of which are always conservative"; "it takes the part of the poor against the rich, of the weak against the strong, of the people against their kingly oppressors, of strict monotheism against the polytheistic and idolatrous conceptions of pure religion." The prophet himself he calls a "convinced enthusiast, animated by great ideas, just indignation, and a sincere patriotism,"—"preachers, poets and divine singers, who were the censors and

consolers of the people,—a kind of tribuneship without official title, the whole power of which resided in the prestige of character and the support lent by conscience.”*

But even on the basis of Réville's definition the term would not be applicable to some men who assuredly deserve to be classed as religious prophets. Are not Carlyle and Tolstoi to be classed among the religious prophets of the world in the truest sense of the word, even if we may not agree with all their doctrines? Yet they did or do not “take the part of strict monotheism against polytheism.” The fact is the term is hardly a broad, generic one. In our minds it is invariably associated with a special phenomenon among *one* people, the Hebrews. And yet the individual has played an important rôle in the religious evolution among all nations. Religious development is never a wholly unconscious growth; in all parts of the world individuals have arisen, men of surpassing genius, who have opened up new paths and diffused among their people purer ideas concerning the deity. And so it was among the Greeks. True, a strictly analogous movement to Hebrew prophetism is not to be found in Hellas. But conditions prevailing in the Hellenic world were different from those obtaining among the Hebrews; the peoples themselves differed widely in natural gifts and bent of mind. Indeed, just as the Hebrews are generally credited with having possessed a special genius for religion, so popular estimate has ascribed to the Greeks a finely developed sense of beauty, and a natural aptitude for enjoying life. And to many minds this seems to have meant that as the Hebrews were an essentially religious, so the Greeks were an essentially irreligious or, at least, non-religious people. Again, the readers of this journal need not be told that the “antique” or “classical” ideal and the ideal of early Christianity are regarded as having been, and actually were two opposing principles of life, the former aiming at the full development of men's inherent powers in this world, the latter fixing its gaze on

* *Prolegomena*, chapter on Prophetism, pp. 150 ff.

a world to come; the former having as its object (as Paulsen puts it) "Weltbejahung" and "Cultur," the latter "Weltverneinung" and "Erlösung."*

Now there is undoubtedly some truth in all this; but it is only a portion of the truth. It must be admitted that Greek religion did not exact from its votaries denial of the world: "love not the world, nor the things that are of the world" was not one of their religious doctrines. Their gods, far from demanding annihilation of self on the part of man, enjoined on him the duty of sharing in the pleasures of the flesh. Nor did the Greeks feel that longing for atonement and redemption, which is often deemed essential in the truly pious man. Their gods are not outside the world, but are decidedly of the world.

Again, it is perfectly true that a highly developed sense of beauty was a marked characteristic of the Greeks as a nation. But is enjoyment of life really incompatible with religious belief? And must we necessarily deny God, in order to worship the beauty and harmony of the universe? Nay, many a reader, perhaps, would defend the opposite tenet, and affirm that to enjoy life in the best sense of the word, and to worship the beautiful, is really religion.

It would be a grievous error to deny to the Greeks the religious instinct; for, if a profound consciousness of man's helplessness and of his dependence on a greater power, and if, to speak with Carlyle, wonder and reverence, on the part of man, mark him as a religious being, then the Greeks surely may lay claim to that title. The uniqueness of their position does not consist in a supposed absence of religion, but in this fact, that with them art was the road and the means whereby they advanced to pure and higher religious conceptions. As a German writer has put it: "In Griechenland ist der Mensch wirklich durch das Morgenthor des Schönen in der Erkenntnis Land gedrungen."[†]

* Cp. the chapter on *Lebensanschauung des Christentums*, in "System der Ethik," I., pp. 62-100.

[†] O. Gruppe, "Griech. Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte," p. 972.

And Homer was the first, of whom we have knowledge, to lead his people onward. But in spite of his signal service to the cause of religion, which can hardly be over-rated, he yet does not deserve to be called a religious prophet. He is first and last a poet and an artist; his aims are those of a poet and artist; and whatever service he rendered in the field of religion he did wholly unconsciously.

With astounding freedom Homer has deliberately ignored everything in Greek cult and belief that would mar the beauty of his work; whatever repellant and debasing there was in religious practice or conception, or in mythology he has rejected. The great heroes whose exploits he celebrated could not be made susceptible to that abject terror with which the netherworld and all that belonged to it may have inspired many a simple mind of that day; an Achilles, 'god-like' man, could not stoop to worship a stone, or a dumb animal; hideous myths like that of Kronos swallowing his children could find no place in the glorious world he depicted; nor is his Olymp inhabited by those monsters of which other religions and Greek religion itself knows; he will allow that at one time giants and gorgons, and monsters with a hundred arms or a hundred heads played a great rôle in the management of the world's affairs; but these times are long past and Homer evidently would fain forget them.

He wrote in an age of incipient decadence for a society of nobles whose history and past achievements he was to celebrate; his was the task to recall the splendor of a by-gone age and to idealize its heroes. But these ideals themselves were only those of strong, sensuous men, unsophisticated and little given to reflection. Homer again was obliged to accommodate the supernatural element to this idealized humanity, —the supernatural which was to form the background and the foil of the purely human drama he enfolded. But while he sang for the pleasure of that society of nobles and *through the exigencies of his art* changed the aspect of religion, he did not know that his verses were destined to become for

many generations the main factor in Greek education; he could not foresee what powerful influence his vivid portrayal of the gods would exert on the imagination of his countrymen. Wholly unconsciously and unintentionally he has delivered the Greek from the worship of all that is below man's level and has permanently given to Greek religion its anthropomorphic character.

For there is nothing which can exceed the intense humanity of the Homeric gods; they seem to us sometimes even more human than Homer's men. As Professor Jebb has observed: "perhaps the persons whom we seem to know best are the intensely human Zeus and Hera, who furnish the only Homeric example of domestic wrangling."*

But even here we lay our finger on that which was destined to hinder and prejudice the growth of Greek religion, as at one time it had helped to uplift Hellenic notions concerning the supernatural. For the marvellously vivid delineation of the divine characters took so firm a hold on Greek imagination that Greek religion, as a national religion, never advanced beyond the anthropomorphic and polytheistic stage. And what are, after all, Homer's gods? A well-known writer has characterized the society of Olympus as "only an ideal Greek society in the lowest sense, the ideal of the school-boy who thinks all control irksome and its absence the '*summum bonum*,'—the ideal of a voluptuous man who has strong passions and longs for the power to indulge them without unpleasant consequences."† If the Homeric gods are ultimately personifications of various aspects of nature (which in several cases is more than doubtful) they certainly have retained little of their original character; we find them invested with a character distinctly human, in the full sense of the word; which means that they are subject to the same frailties and faults human nature suffers from. The gods are superior to men in that they are immortal, enjoying an ever-

* Homer, introd. to the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey," p. 24.

† Mahaffy, "Social Life in Greece," p. 40.

blooming youth, and in that they have greater, even wonder-working power. But they are moved by likes and dislikes, by desire and passion, by fear and anger, by vanity and pride, like any mortal. Nay, sometimes war will break out between them.

Under these circumstances we cannot expect to find a *moral purpose* behind the divine management of the world's affairs; it is totally absent. The whole divine rule many a time bears a strong resemblance to chaos pure and simple. And yet the Greek felt that harmony and beauty ruled the universe; he dimly felt the unity of the divine behind this multiplicity of forces which he worshipped; hence Homer's honest efforts to place Zeus above the other gods which however do not end in more than in making Zeus "exercise a sort of limited monarchy over (his) distracted realm"; again in such conceptions as those of Destiny and Fate, fitfully present throughout the poems, there is painful groping after a Something Higher and Greater than even Zeus himself.

But when the age of reflection had come, and the demand for a just God, who ruled the universe not by caprice but by wisdom and goodness, had lifted its voice, then the religious prophet among the Greeks found himself and his people heavily handicapped through the creation of the same poet, who at one time, had saved them from religious stagnation in a pool of superstitious cult and fetish-worship.

V.

THE CONFESSION AND FREEDOM OF THOUGHT.

BY A. E. TRUXAL, D.D.

Creeds and confessions in a general way mean the same thing. They belong to the same general class. Yet there is a specific difference between a creed and a confession. A creed sets before the believer's heart the objects of faith. The objects of the Christian creed in their simplest form are Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The Christian believes in the Father, in Jesus Christ and in the Holy Spirit. Under each of these general heads may be placed some particulars as necessarily involved in them. The Father may be described in the creed as Creator, Preserver and Ruler; the nature of the Son and His work as Savior may be set forth; and the necessary results flowing from the operations of the Spirit may be given. But all these added articles in the creed must be general in contents and brief in form. A good example we have in the Apostles' Creed. A creed is a "form of sound words" in which the believer expresses his faith. It sets forth the objects on which the heart rests. No one can be an orthodox Christian who does not receive the creed as the expression of his faith.

A confession is an explanation of the creed. Its purpose is to elaborate and set forth at some length the contents and meaning of the creed. It is addressed to the intellect as well as to the heart. It contains a "form of sound words" by which the mind and heart give expression to their convictions and conceptions of God and divine things. A system of theology is addressed to the reason. It is an effort to set forth divine truth agreeably to the demands of the logical intellect. The nature of the subjects treated in a work on theology makes it necessary that portions of it at least must be more

or less of a speculative character. The confession stands midway between the creed and systematic theology, in that it addresses both faith and reason and gives believers the form by which they are to express the feelings of their heart and the conceptions of their mind. To the extent that the element of speculation enters into a confession is it untrue to its legitimate purpose. For example, the confession ought to set forth and emphasize the fact that Christ died for the sins of men, but when it endeavors to explain how the death of Christ becomes efficacious for this purpose and effects a reconciliation between man and God, then it gets beyond its own legitimate sphere; for no theologian has thus far been able to formulate a theory of the atonement that is satisfactory to the whole church or even to all the minds in any particular branch of the church. As confessions in no case stand for the whole church, but each is to represent the faith and conceptions of a denomination in its differentiation from other branches it is of course not possible for them to exclude all disputed questions. Nevertheless that confession whose contents are most largely in harmony with the general consensus of faith and belief will be the strongest and most efficacious in the accomplishment of its end.

Again, a confession necessarily represents the ideas and conceptions as these prevail in the consciousness of the church at the time when the confession is formulated. These ideas and conceptions are in advance of those which prevailed in the church at former periods; if they were not there would be no justification in framing the confession. But as the ages roll on the consciousness of the church also moves forward. New ideas come to the front, old conceptions are modified, and the general consciousness of the church gradually assumes a new form. The world never stands still. It moves, sometimes slowly indeed, and then again rapidly. Universal knowledge increases and clarifies itself. Mankind learns by experience. The time comes sooner or later when the confession no longer properly expresses the faith and convictions

of the body of the church. A creed never becomes a fossil, but a confession gradually becomes fossilized in some of its features. As time passes on and conditions change the contents of the confession are stretched in all directions in order that they may cover the varied contingencies as they arise, until their elasticity has all been spent, and then they are one after another let go and suffered to withdraw into their original form and there lie dead as monuments of the past. Confessions are necessary. At least they were necessary in former centuries. It is a question, however, whether the usefulness of confessions such as those framed and proclaimed in the sixteenth century is not fast drawing to a close and whether they will not in the near future be displaced by creeds or confessions more of a creed-like character, and the majority of the subjects treated by confessions be turned over to the department of theology to which they really belong. At any rate confessions cannot be absolutely binding upon the conscience and minds of believers. The general truth and scheme underlying the confession must be accepted as long as it remains in force as the confession of the church, but as regards many and various particulars freedom of thought must be allowed. The confession dare not become a pope to decide absolutely all questions of faith and doctrine that may arise by its words and forms of expression. To put any confession to such use would be to rob it of its real power and usefulness.

Among the various confessions none stands higher in the Protestant Church in general than the Heidelberg Catechism. It is pervaded by a peculiar warmth of piety and spiritual unction that endear it to the minds and hearts of all who study it. It has proven itself to be one of the most popular of all the confessions. Dr. Schaff says: "The Heidelberg Catechism was translated into all the European and many Asiatic languages. It has the pentecostal gift of tongues in a rare degree. It is stated that next to the Bible, the Imitation of Christ by Thomas á Kempis, and Bunyan's Pil-

grim's Progress no book has been more frequently translated, more widely circulated and used.*

The same learned author says further, "as a Catechism it is an acknowledged masterpiece with a few to equal and none to surpass it."† There was a time when the catechism was in a measure forgotten in certain portions of the Reformed Church in this country, and a form of faith and practice came to prevail different from that represented by the catechism. Dr. J. H. A. Bomberger, in 1863, speaking of the catechism in that period said: "The day of its glory had waned. Many were wild with joy that they had escaped its thralldom, and clapped their hands with pious merriment now that those hands were no longer shackled by its old, rusty chains. No longer should it furnish the tools for manufacturing church members; the machine shop was shut up. The fathers might have honored the book and the system as they pleased; their sprightlier sons were not to be duped by the doting affections of the ancients. So the catechism was laid aside, and catechetical instruction was either wholly abolished or the term of it reduced to the briefest possible limits."‡ Again speaking of the preaching at that time he says that Christ and the leading doctrines of the christian faith were indeed not forgotten but these "were not preached in the sense and spirit and conception of the Catechism and in its deep christological apprehension of the gospel. That which was proclaimed was indeed, to a large extent, another Gospel." The confession was subjected to a similar and greater decline also in the land of its birth. Dr. C. Ullman designated it as a "Downfall of the Heidelberg Catechism in the Palatinate" and says that its use as a book of instruction had been discontinued and the doctrines which it contained largely abandoned.‡

* "Creeds of Christendom," Vol. I., p. 536.

* *Ibid.*, p. 540.

† "Tercentenary Monument," p. 535.

‡ See his essay in "Tercentenary Monument," p. 115.

No class of persons did more to revive the use of the catechism and to reinstate the form of faith and piety represented by it than the founders and teachers of Mercersburg Theology at the head of whom stood the late Dr. John W. Nevin. He and his followers were loyal and true to the confession of the church. Not that they slavishly held to each and every particular of the teachings of the catechism, but they held to its fundamental tenets, and emphasized especially the educational system of religion in the bosom of which the catechism stood. They brought forward the creed, cultus and worship which were in harmony with the confession in its historical sense. But they did not hold to the catechism in such sense as to destroy the freedom of thought on theological questions. Dr. Bomberger in his articles from which we have quoted says: "The liberal spirit, in regard to non-essentials, which animates the work was, indeed, cordially cherished." The leaders in the church of that day went farther than this and did not hesitate to hold and proclaim views and conceptions different from those embodied in the catechism, though not in contradiction of the fundamental articles of the faith. What we mean will become clear by a comparison of some of the teachings of the confession with the ideas and conceptions contained in the "Order of Worship," which may be taken as a fair representation of Mercersburg Theology.

Let us examine a few examples. In regard to the church the catechism teaches, "That out of the whole human race, from the beginning to the end of the world, the Son of God, by his spirit and word, gathers, defends and preserves for himself, unto everlasting life, a chosen communion in the unity of the true faith." Place now by the side of these words what the Order of Worship says. The first collect for Whitsunday begins thus: "God of all peace and consolation, who didst gloriously fulfill the great promise of the Gospel, by sending down the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, *to establish the church as the home of his continual*

presence and power among men"; and the collect for Whitsunday begins, "Most glorious and blessed God who *through the Holy Ghost hast made Thy One Holy Catholic Church to be the body of Christ, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.*" We do not say that there is a contradiction between the two representations here given, but we affirm what every discriminating student of theology will readily apprehend, namely, that the views of the catechism and those of the Order of Worship move along two entirely different lines of thought. It is not necessary to argue this point, for any one to whom the difference is not at once evident would not be able to grasp it though a lengthy discussion were submitted. Again, the catechism asks: "How is it signified and sealed to thee in Holy Baptism that thou has part in the one sacrifice on the cross?" And it answers: "Thus: that Christ has appointed this outward washing with water and has joined therewith this promise, that I am washed with his blood and spirit from the pollution of the soul, that is from all my sins, as certainly as I am washed outwardly with water, whereby commonly the filthiness of the body is taken away." Compare with this the following from the baptismal service of the Order of Worship: "You present this child here and do seek for him deliverance from the power of the Devil, the remission of sin and *the gift of a new Spiritual life by the Holy Ghost, through the sacrament of Baptism, which Christ has ordained for the communication of such great grace.*" It would be superfluous to analyze these latter statements for the intelligent readers of the REVIEW, to show that their conceptions of Baptism are of an entirely different order from those in the former representations. The two deliverances mean two different things theologically. Then again, let us take all that the catechism teaches on the subject of the Lord's Supper and place along side of it the statements of the Order of Worship that our blessed Savior "solemnly instituted the holy sacrament of His own body and blood, that it might be the abiding memorial of His

precious death, the seal of His perpetual presence in the church by the Holy Ghost, *the mystical exhibition of His one offering of Himself*, made once but of force always, to put away sin, the pledge of His undying love to His people, and the bond of His living union and fellowship with them to the end of time." It is scarcely necessary for us to say that the italics in the foregoing quotations are our own. And we have given these quotations not for the purpose of passing judgment on either series of teaching. We are not concerned now as to whether the representations of the catechism or those of the Order of Worship set forth the truth in regard to these subjects more fully and correctly; but we wish to call attention to the manifest fact that the framers of our ceremonies and forms of worship did not feel themselves rigidly bound by the ideas and conceptions of the confession of faith. They did not hesitate to go beyond its teaching and to enter upon new and different lines of thoughts. This liberty was vouchsafed unto them by the spirit and genius of the Reformed Church. The spirit of freedom as characteristic of the Reformed branch of protestantism manifested itself in the beginning in the production of no less than sixteen different confessions in a little more than a hundred years. It is true this diversity was occasioned by the fact that the Reformed Church spread over a number of different nations; and it may be regarded by some as a weakness. But it is indicative of the freedom of thought in this branch of protestantism, and that is a source of strength too. And no confession breathes a more irenic and charitable spirit than the Heidelberg Catechism and no church has manifested a larger spirit of liberty and charity in all things than the Reformed Church. We know that Drs. Nevin and Schaff were twice arraigned before the synod for teaching heresy, but twice they were acquitted too, not so much because the members of the body could find in the Heidelberg Catechism a foundation for the teaching of these professors but because they believed in the right of free inquiry and study and of untrammelled

thought, and further because they believed the positions of the persons arraigned were founded in the truth of God's word as revealed in the Bible and the history of the church.

One of the foundation stones upon which the professors of our church rested their teaching and by which they defended the same was the fact of historical development which had been apprehended and described by some of the theologians of Germany and was now taught and proclaimed by our teachers. The ministers and educated elders of the Reformed Church of that early day accepted the theory of development as being true, and were ready to apply it in its broadest sense, as being operative in every department of the world's life. They saw the law of development working in politics, commerce, science, art, education, morals and religion. Hence they were not willing to hold any man slavishly bound by the ideas and knowledge of three hundred years earlier. All that seemed to them to be required was that a teacher's views should not be subversive of the faith and destructive of christianity. There were indeed some in the Reformed Church and many outside her borders who raised a great hue and cry against the theory or doctrine of historical development. But since then it has come to be almost universally accepted, not so much, however, by the name of development as by that of evolution. The reason for its general acceptance is found in this, that development is not simply a theory or a doctrine, but an objective *fact*. *It is a law of the world's life* under its most general aspect, and of every particular form of life too. Theologians and philosophers have apprehended this law, traced it and described its operations. The tree grows from the acorn. Whether we say that the tree is developed from the germ in the acorn or evolved out of it amounts to the same thing. But men's apprehensions of the law of development or evolution vary. No one has yet fully and accurately comprehended it in all its operations. It will continue to be investigated and studied and will no doubt be better understood in the future than it is now.

Some have held that God first of all created the material universe, that it developed until a form was reached fit for the abode of life; then God by an almighty fiat brought the vegetable into existence, and it developed until the law of its life was exhausted; then by another fiat God created animal life, and it developed until its highest stage was reached; then by another fiat He created man with a soul life, and now man is developing under every form of his varied activity. That is one apprehension of the process of development. It divides it into stages and periods. Others behold the process differently. They find no place for these divine fiats; but claim that there is one continuous development or evolution from the original moneron through a thousand different stages until man is finally reached. But in that case, as Dr. Hudson clearly shows, to be true to the fundamental principles of evolution which may be expressed by the maxim, "*ex nihilo nihil fit*," the highest form of life, which is reached in the psychic nature of man must have been present in type, principle, and possibility in the primal moneron.* But whatever may be the true apprehension of it, development is found everywhere and in everything and is the law by which God carries on His operations in the world. There is development in ideas, in conceptions, in ethics, in doctrines, in religion. Consequently it is folly and ignorant wickedness to endeavor to enthrall men's minds and hearts by the apprehensions of much earlier ages in which the circumstances and conditions were entirely different from those of the present. And yet we are every now and then confronted by the anomaly of men who claim to hold firmly to the doctrine of historical development and yet insist upon it in the spirit of superior piety that teachers of the present day must be bound hand and foot by the original and literal meaning of a confession formulated three hundred and fifty years ago!

The report of the peace commission adopted by the General Synod of Tiffin, in 1881, shows on the face of it that it

* "*The Divine Pedigree of Man*," by Thomas Jay Hudson, LL.D.

was in many respects a compromise. This was something that was in the very nature of the case to have been expected; but its position on the Heidelberg Catechism is in harmony, though conservatively so, with the contention of this paper. It says that the Reformed Church adheres "to the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures as set forth in the Heidelberg Catechism, taking the same in its historical (or original) sense." The words thrown in parenthesis make the statement somewhat confusing. If it is meant that the words of the Catechism are to be construed independent of the causes in the past history of the church which led up to its formation and the general condition of the church at the time, then the historical sense would be excluded. The true historical sense of any production can be apprehended only when it is studied in the light of the forces at work in previous periods and of the environments at the time of its origin and of its course through the centuries down to the present day. All these things must be taken into consideration when we wish to learn the meaning which any confession is to have for us now. Whatever the construction that is to be put on the words above quoted, the report follows them with the statement that, "This action is not to be so construed as to forbid, or interfere with, that (degree of) freedom in scriptural and theological investigation which has always been enjoyed in the Reformed Church." This places the Reformed Church of this country fairly and squarely on the position of liberty of thought and conviction on theological question. Nothing is ever gained in the sphere of truth by coercion. Here fact must be met by fact and argument by argument. The only way that error may be overcome is by turning the light of truth upon it. This does not mean however that teachers and preachers shall abuse the freedom allowed them by their church. They have no right to employ their talents and views for the destruction of the faith or for a hinderance to holy living. Representatives of a church whose confession is the Heidelberg Catechism must necessarily teach the union of the believers with

Christ; the sinfulness of men; God the Father, the Creator, and preserver of all thing; Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Revealer of the Father, the Savior of men, who died for their sins; the Holy Spirit, the regenerator and sanctifier of them that believe; the Church, the body of believers; the sacraments, the signs and seals of divine grace; conversion from sin; worship and service of the Lord; obedience to the commandments and holy living; resurrection from the dead, everlasting life and judgment to come. These are things that must be believed and taught by every member and teacher of the Reformed Church. It is the duty of anyone who cannot do so to remain quiet. He cannot then be a teacher in any sense, but may be a learner.

But when it comes to the theological questions involved in these and other subjects contained in the confession, freedom of opinion must be tolerated. As to how the union of the believer with Christ is to be effected and maintained some may emphasize the necessity of faith, others the sacraments and others the work of the Holy Spirit. There may be differences of opinion as to the origin of men's sins and the degree of human depravity; as to the mode of creation and the manner of God's providence; as to the relation of the Son to the Father and of the two natures to each other in the person of Christ; as to the doctrine of the atonement; as to the office and work of the Holy Spirit; as to the nature of the church; as to the meaning and purpose of the sacraments; as to regeneration and conversion; and as to a number of other questions involved in the teaching of the catechism. Persons acquainted with the controversy that was waged in our church forty years ago know that different views were then held in regard to the church and the sacraments. Some adhered to the literal expressions of the catechism, others went far beyond its statement on these subjects. Attention has already been called to the difference between the representations of the confession and those of the Order of Worship. On the doctrines of predestination and the perseverance of

saints which are mildly taught in the catechism different views may be held. All persons hold to the truth so plainly taught in the Scriptures that Christ died for our sins, but various views of the atonement may be tolerated, though the catechism inclines to a particular theory. For it must not be forgotten that the confession does not stand above the Bible. It is true that the confession is to be an aid in the understanding of the Bible, but on the other hand it is still more true that the confession must be understood in the light of the teaching of God's word. There is no contradiction in this statement. It is not as paradoxical as the saying of Christ that "he that loses his life shall find it" or that "the dead shall bury the dead." Some things are primary and others are secondary. The Bible is the fountal source of the knowledge of divine things. The catechism is an aid to the proper understanding of the Bible. So is the history of the world, and the history of the church, both under its Jewish and Christian dispensation, and the history of the various doctrines as these have worked themselves out in the experience of christians, as individuals, and as a collective body; and so is archæology and so are the natural sciences as these are developed from age to age. Each of these departments of investigation and study in its own way helps searchers after the truth to reach proper conclusions. And he who ignores the light furnished by these aids and clings alone to the literal and original interpretation of a confession formed three hundred years ago, no matter how good and true and excellent that confession may have been in its day, will be possessed of very narrow and contracted views and convictions, and will sooner or later discover that they will carry but little convincing force for the minds and hearts of his intelligent fellowmen. The world and the church have passed that day in which the freedom of thought can be forbidden.

VI.

AUGUSTE SABATIER.—A PERSONAL STUDY.

BY LOUISE SEYMOUR HOUGHTON.

The review of the late Auguste Sabatier's posthumous work, "Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit," contributed by Professor Stevens to the last number of the REVIEW, contains just that personal touch which suggests the profound influence which Dean Sabatier exerted upon all who knew him. It is seldom that the personality of a writer counts for more than his printed utterances in the impress that he will make upon the future; and if Dean Sabatier's fellow workers and friends believe that his influence will be potent long after his writings have been superseded, it is because they know that it will persist in the lives and teachings of men who felt the touch of his personality, of qualities which Professor Stevens did not describe, but which shine out through his brief allusion. This is why it is worth while to study the man, not less than the writings which are so important a message to the present age.

The late Dean of the Protestant Faculty of Theology in the University of Paris, the author of "The Apostle Paul," "Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion," and of that posthumous work which Professor Stevens reviewed, was an encyclopedic scholar, a brilliant writer, an original thinker, and the most conspicuous among the founders of a new school of theology. More than any other man of his time he contributed to that harmony between religion and science which is the mandate of the present day. If, therefore, as his disciples believe, there is a more lasting force in his personality than in his writings, it can be hardly possible to estimate the value of these writings, without some acquaintance with the man that Auguste Sabatier was.

In a more than usual sense he was the child of his ancestry and his birthplace. He came of a family of peasant proprietors of that "strong race," as Bismarck called them, the Cevenols, and the sturdy virtues of his race were in his fiber. His mother was of Huguenot descent, and the heroic faith, the ardent piety, the "Huguenot patience," the passionate fidelity to principle, which distinguished Auguste Sabatier were his maternal heritage. His birthplace was a foster-mother of these inherited qualities. Vallon is a hill-village looking over a broad plain, cleft by the silver stream of the Ardèche, and closed on the far horizon by the Cevennes Mountains. No village has more heroic traditions. The fortress-like church on the hill is a monument of the storm and stress of the seventeenth century; and not all the onslaughts of that tumultuous time availed to destroy it, or the faith for which it stood. Under the fires of persecution the love of the Vallonais for their village passed into a proverb.

"Who quits Vallon
Has lost his reason,"

says the rude old rhyme. Auguste Sabatier never quitted it in heart, and the vacations of his busy years were spent in the ancestral home.

On the outskirts of the village stands the *Mas des Aires*, (clustered barn-floors), the old family farmstead in which Auguste Sabatier was born. The strong gray walls and the great gateway, which in the old time was closed by heavy doors capable of stout resistance to rude attack, still speak of the religious wars. Travellers in the Cevennes country often see from a distance these lonely, fortress-like farm houses, but one must live among these people, attend their religious services, join in their fireside conversations, to learn how the memory of those bitter years persists in the very warp of being of the men and women of to-day. The little family cemeteries, like that one in which Auguste Sabatier lies buried, are as frequently to be met in the Cevennes as in our

own New England, but the story they tell is of generations of intolerance barely yet outlived, when a Protestant might not sleep his last sleep in consecrated ground.

Surroundings like these deeply impressed the imaginative boy. Every rock and hill top around Vallon has its heroic tradition, every forest its memory of those "desert meetings" which were the outstanding events of the years of persecution. At the risk of the galleys or of life imprisonment the people would stealthily gather from wide distances, thousands in number, in some sequestered "desert" place, to hear the words of life from the lips of a banished pastor, who with a price upon his head, and the certainty of death, the probability of torture, if he were taken, had bravely crossed the frontier of exile, to break, if only once, the bread of life for the famished flock. One of Auguste Sabatier's favorite boyhood walks was to "that splendor of Cevenol nature," the *Pont d'Arc*, an immense natural bridge wrought in the night of ages by the river Ardèche. Nearing it, he might turn aside to that grotto, celebrated in the annals of the countryside, where long ago the Huguenots of Vallon used to assemble for their "desert" worship. There is still the boulder on which the preacher used to stand, and there the crevice in the rocky rampart, from which the hidden outposts espied the approach of the "booted missionaries" of Louis XIV., in time—or possibly not in time—to warn the faithful that they must flee.

Traditions of such a past are in the very warp of the Cevenol character; their impress on the thoughtful boy's mind was ineffaceable. He was a son of the Reformation, and it is not the smallest of his filial services that in his latest work he frees certain doctrines of the Reformation from the accretions of centuries, and restores them to the church in pristine purity.

Auguste Sabatier was also the child of his own time. That religious awakening which swept over Protestant France in the fourth decade of the last century, and is still spoken of as

"the Revival" had formed the religious character of his parents, and his own soul felt its influence. He was born in 1839, before that revival strength was spent, and his earliest impressions were of its modest conventicles. "I knew that generation in my humble village," he wrote in later life. "The beautiful days of Pentecost seemed to have come back. The farm house kitchen, the cobbler's shop, the notary's office, the pastor's study, became so many upper rooms, places of prayer and fraternal communion. What simplicity of heart! What nobility of life!" This double heritage of revival enthusiasm and Huguenot steadfastness is the key to the great theologian's influence.

Most of all was Auguste Sabatier the son of his mother. The father of the family died early, leaving Auguste and his four little sisters to the care of their godly mother and their sturdy, hard-headed grandfather. The mother's singular piety gave her an enduring influence over her son. "Ah, if I had but my mother's faith!" the man of deep religious experience would often sigh in later years. It is a striking witness to the humility of his own piety, that this brilliant theologian and profound philosopher always tested his own thought by the touchstone of his mother's prayers. He felt confident that the travail of his thought was not leading him astray, "because he could always pray with her."

As the only son and the eldest of five children, Auguste Sabatier was naturally destined to carry on his father's farm. But the brilliant prophecy of his early school days could not be misread. The school master at Vallon astonished by his precocity, insisted that Auguste must be educated; the pastor, impressed by his piety, that he must be trained for the ministry. The grandfather protested; Auguste was needed on the farm; but the exultant, pious mother, by such tact as only those can divine who understand the patriarchal system that prevails in France to-day, smoothed the way for her son to be sent to the famous Olivier school at Ganges, which has given more than one man of note to France.

From Ganges, where Auguste Sabatier outstripped all his school fellows in classical learning, he carried a well-trained mind to the University at Montpellier. The impression he made upon his classmates was of "a modest youth of very vital piety, self-contained, orderly, too thoughtful to be over gay, yet too healthy-minded not to know how to laugh admirably." His journal bears witness to his rigid self-discipline. The tireless workers of later years speaks in the page where the boy of sixteen takes himself to task for having wasted five hours in one week.

At nineteen Auguste Sabatier took his classical degree with honors, and entered the theological seminary of Montauban. The process of development which culminated in the work lately published on "The Religion of the Spirit" had already begun, for his prayer on entering the seminary was that God would make him "daily, every moment, enjoy the blessedness of living in communion with God, in Christ." His theological professor, the venerable Professor Pédézert of Montauban, writing of Auguste Sabatier after his death, and quoting Guizot's sorrowful words, "I am weary of seeing people die," said, "Those years at Montauban were particularly honorable for M. Sabatier. The theological profession of Paris has done nothing for which the Montauban student did not even then give us reason to hope." Dr. Pédézert is of the ultra-orthodox school, and his pupil began to think independently even while sitting at his feet, but the friendship between the two was never interrupted.

At Montauban Auguste Sabatier writes of a great development going on in his views of life, though not, as yet, of doctrine. "This life is not the life of my soul, and cannot be. The fleeting hours awake within it a thirst that time cannot quench. I must have life, not life past or future, but life present and *untemporary*. I must have eternal life. * * * I must rise to the sphere of the immutable and invisible. It is the life of God for which I sigh. My God, make me live!" He was then nineteen years old.

Life thus apprehended inevitably compelled him to revise his beliefs. "I am shaken in my dearest convictions," we find him writing six months later, "torn by doubt. I shall neglect no means of emerging from this state, and with the help of God I hope to triumph." Not long after, when profoundly engaged in the devitalizing study of dogmatics, he wrote: "I ask God every day to give me enough of truth to live by," and upon truth he thenceforth lived.

Though he did not then reach finality of dogmatic conviction,—indeed, from this time theology was to him an ever developing science, he did reach finality of trust. In these early years he found rest in God, and from this time he was serenely sheltered from the onslaughts of doubt. The true character of life began to unfold itself before him. "Life is not the movement of legs and arms, life is the love of God and of the neighbor, life is Christ. * * * He lives who lives for heaven, who does not give himself entirely to earth, who keeps his life for God and consecrates it to him. It is thus that I would live."

In 1863, at the age of twenty-four, Auguste Sabatier took his degree of bachelor of divinity, presenting a brilliant thesis on "The Witness of Jesus Christ to himself." By the advice of his professors he undertook a course of foreign graduate study, first in Basle, where his preaching was greatly admired, then in Tübingen, Erlangen, Bonn and Heidelberg. His passionate desire for truth impelling him to devote himself to criticism and biblical theology, he found it impossible at once to obey the call to the newly created parish of Aubenas, in his native commune; but the church consenting to wait, he entered upon this charge at the end of 1864, one of his sisters coming to keep house for him. The character of his theology, not less than his genial temperament, made him an acceptable pastor; yet he was still a student, and at the close of his second year at Aubenas he sustained at Montauban two theses for his licentiate. The Latin thesis was on "The Date of St. John's Gospel," the French thesis on "The

Authorities for the Life of Jesus." Thus he took his place in the historic school of theology. Shortly after, writing to Edmond de Pressensé, he said that his life task should be "to study religion in complete scientific liberty."

That year Auguste Sabatier married a gifted young Swiss teacher, Mlle Elise Versel. Life was opening before him in marvellous beauty. Happy in his home, he already had his place in a wide circle of thoughtful men. His theses had attracted much attention. He was regarded as a brilliant light arising in the theological firmament. Guizot, then Minister of Public Instruction, urged him to become a candidate for the recently vacated chair of Dogmatics in the Reformed Faculty of the University of Strasburg. In his letter of candidacy he thus reveals his life motive:

"The Church, which has need of faith and liberty, has need also of science. * * * It is true that many deem science and faith to be irreconcilable. I have never thought so, and I now think so less than ever. Both are necessary. They are called not to mutual destruction but to mutual strengthening. For me their reconciliation is effected in Jesus Christ. I find in him peace of intellect because I have found in him peace of soul." All his future work was given to the defence of this position, and although, as he always admitted, the form of his faith underwent development, its substance remained unchanged.

Sabatier received the Strasburg appointment in 1869, when he was just thirty years old, his colleagues being such men as Reuss and Colani. According to the French educational system, his appointment entailed upon him the task of maintaining a thesis for the doctor's degree, and this he did in the following year, his subject being "The Apostle Paul," and his thesis that work which, translated into several languages, made him known to the entire Christian world. The maintenance of this thesis was a brilliant theological tournament, never forgotten by those who witnessed it. His three examiners, Bruch, Reuss and Colani, were all opposed

to his views and brought their best powers to refute them, but the victory was his.

His place in the world seemed now to be secure. Students flocked to his class room, eager for lectures as captivating as they were substantial. His books were read, his opinions discussed, all over Europe.—In the very hour of success came crushing grief. His wife died, and the preface to the book which, even before its publication, had won him wide renown, bears a tribute to her memory, of such penetrating emotion as can be compared only with Renan's dedication of the *Vie de Jésus* to his sister Henriette.

"Let me be permitted to inscribe thy beloved name upon the first page of this book. Will it ever be known how much it is thine? Amid these long and dry discussions will any one find something of thy childlike faith, thy valiant and tender soul, which so often inspired and upheld my own? I hope so.

"After thy departure I found a bitter consolation in taking up again this book which, smiling, thou didst call *our* work. As I went on with it I felt myself still working with thee and for thee, and thus a little longer I have kept hold on that past—my very life—which is now vanishing away and leaving me desolate."

Upon the destruction of his home fast followed the woes of his country—how intensely felt by thinking Frenchmen only those can know who lived with them through that time. To the passionately loyal spirit of Auguste Sabatier the declaration of war was a crushing blow. In his student days he had learned to love the German people, and it was poignant anguish to him to learn that they could fight against his country. The break up of the Strasburg faculty was the shattering of his life career. In Strasburg, a city where French thought and German science were allied as nowhere else, he had found the true home of his mind, the true field for the work he had to do. Around him had gathered many congenial friendships which it was hard to break up. On the day when the city was invested he had left Strasburg with his young sister, but at once returned and offered his services to the French artillery. Not unnaturally, perhaps, these were declined, whereupon he organized with his students

a "Huguenot ambulance," which became known through all the army of the Loire, and by which, like many other Protestant ministers, he carried the blessings of the red cross flag to many a field of battle.

Auguste Sabatier was slow to realize that Strasburg could no longer be the scene of his work. The war ended, he inaugurated courses of free lectures in the French language and literature. It is easy to imagine that the newly constituted authorities looked askance upon him, and before long, one of his lectures giving offence, from some supposedly disparaging comparisons of German with French women, he received notice to leave the city within twenty-four hours. This he did, carrying with him a bronze *Alsacienne*, the gift of the women of Strasburg, which ever afterward stood on his study table.

Thus at thirty-three the fabric of his life was shattered, and in bereavement and humiliation he had to begin all over again. It was long before, amid straitness of means and travail of thought, he fought his way back to peace. But at last a great peace took possession of his soul. He became aware that a new task had been laid upon him, "to be faithful to lost causes." Thenceforth the gentleness of his judgments was a large element of his greatness.

The dean of the Strasburg theological faculty, Professor Lichtenberger, had been banished from that city for a cause similar to that which had made Sabatier a refugee. With indescribable heroism and self-denial the two colleagues undertook to restore to France something of what it had lost in losing the Strasburg University. The American theologians who in growing numbers seek fresh inspiration in the theological faculty of the Paris University little dream by what arduous labors, in what poverty of resources, the foundations of that faculty were laid. The endeavor had the moral support of such men as the pastor-senator de Pressensé and Roger Hollard, but material support they had none to offer. The lectures were given in Sabatier's dining room until, in

1877, the French government, urged by Gambetta, Jules Ferry and Waddington, took up the work, and the Faculty of Protestant theology was made a school of the university, with Lichtenberger dean and Auguste Sabatier professor of Reformed Dogmatics. Of its subsequent growth there is no need here to speak. To Sabatier the importance of theology was supreme, in that "deficit of religious thought" from which, in her hour of humiliation, his country was suffering. All other disciplines interested him, and he excelled in many, but to theology he dedicated his life, and his latest book, to the last degree spiritual and experimental, culminates in a detailed plan for a reconstructed statement of Christian doctrine.

The stringent poverty of the initial efforts past, Auguste Sabatier reconstructed his home by marrying a gifted and highly cultivated woman, Mlle Franklin Grout. She was of Roman Catholic family but Protestant convictions, and till the close of his life she was her husband's faithful and congenial companion and friend. By degrees a wide circle of friends gathered about their home. They were of different beliefs and varying literary interests, but in Auguste Sabatier they found a unifying bond.

From first to last Sabatier's activity was prodigious. His lectures were many, his pen was never idle, and yet he had always time for interviews with his pupils or with any who seriously desired light. For many years he was superintendent in Pastor Bersier's Sunday-school of *l'Etoile* Church, and led a teachers' meeting of remarkable fruitfulness. When Bersier died Sabatier took up his work on the *Revue Chrétienne*, to which he contributed valuable monthly articles, without a single break, from that time until his death. For several months after his death they continued to appear, the articles having been prepared in advance in view of a contemplated holiday. Sabatier also wrote regularly for the *Revue Critique* and the *Journal de Genève*, contributing to the latter brilliant weekly articles on subjects political

as well as literary. These contributions attracted the attention of political leaders, and in 1882 Sabatier was called to an editorial position on *Le Temps* daily newspaper. This position he held until his death, writing a daily "leader," the substance of which, telegraphed in advance of publication to Rome, London and Berlin, gave to all Europe the note of the French political situation. His articles were always recognizable by a severe morality and an all-embracing sympathy. At his funeral the editor-in-chief of *Le Temps* said of him that he was "a true knight of knowledge, justice and freedom, always warring against intolerance wherever it appeared."

This enormous journalistic output by no means exhausted the amazing fertility of Auguste Sabatier's mind. He wrote much in the Biographical Review of the Faculty, and in the *Revue de Théologie et Philosophie* of Lausanne, and published many pamphlets. For the *Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses* he wrote many weighty articles, and it was in his study of Jesus Christ, published in the *Encyclopédie* in 1880, that his liberal tendencies first became clearly manifest. He left behind him a large number of manuscripts, besides the great work which crowns the labors of his life, and one of these, a careful historic study of the Atonement, had already been published before "Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit" saw the light.

Though Sabatier wrote so much for ephemeral purposes, and necessarily with great rapidity, the literary beauty of his style is held by his contemporaries to have been unequalled since Cousin and Renan. His intense love of classical literature corrected any tendency to obscurity which might have been fostered by his wide German reading; and his rapid, fluent French, direct, analytic, highly picturesque, abounding in metaphor yet always self-contained and strong, is at once the delight and the despair of his translators.

Sabatier's noblest talent, however, was for teaching, and his most lasting influence will be carried into the future, not

by his books but by the minds that he formed in the class room. "He was a marvellous professor," says his pupil and later colleague, Professor John Viénot. "His mind was a blend of clarity and logic; the material organized itself so that each lecture was a complete whole. He carried his hearers from point of light to point of light. And to harmony and lucidity he added warmth, fire, brightness, the awakening word, the unerring shaft, life."

He was the counsellor and friend of his students, seeing them often privately, trying to inspire them with his own love of work and passion for goodness. He gathered around him a student theological society in which, in free and familiar conversation, he guided the young men in their scientific researches and their religious meditations. "I would save the faith of my pupils," he used often to say, and he bent all the energies of his marvellous mind to the reconciliation of "all that is eternal in the Christian faith with the most rigid demands of the scientific spirit." Not by the facile method of showing real or fancied analogies between physical facts and theological dogmas, but by bringing the irrefutable facts of human experience to bear witness to the unity of the human mind and the unity of the external world, visible and invisible, did the creative and devout mind of Auguste Sabatier bring religious dogma into alliance with scientific method, and "save the faith" of many. The varieties of bewilderment to which he brought the illuminating torch were almost beyond reckoning. Priests who in breaking away from Rome were in peril of spiritual shipwreck, young men of pious training, blinded by unfamiliar methods of research, men of original genius not anchored in religious habit, all alike, as Paster Bourrier, himself once a priest, has said, "felt his influence, steadying, enlightening, inspiring them" to that better thing than honest doubt, intelligent faith. Such an influence exerted upon group after group of young men will be formative in French thought for generations to come.

Sabatier's teachings were not confined to the theological

faculty. He lectured also in University School of Arts and in its *Ecole des Hautes Études*, of which he was a director. In the section of the Documentary Study of Religions, of this school, he gave courses in New Testament exegesis which, though not a required study, and indeed not addressed to theologues, were attended by his students in a body. His teaching powers were early recognized in other countries. In 1874 he was invited to give a course of lectures at the University of Geneva, and twenty-two years later he gave there a course of lectures which were the foundation of that noble work, "Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion." Upon its publication it was translated into English, German and Swedish; invitations from learned bodies were showered upon him, and he read important papers before religious congresses in Sweden and England.

When Lichtenberger retired, Sabatier was made dean of the Faculty of Protestant Theology. He had held the office of vice-president of the University Council since its creation, and was thrice elected by his colleagues to represent the University on the Superior Council of Public Instruction. From the government he received the rosettes of Officer of Public Instruction and of the Legion of Honor, thus attaining high official station. Associated in office with Roman Catholics and free thinkers, he exerted so profound an influence upon his colleagues as to be enabled to render many important services to the Protestant cause.

Sabatier never preached in Paris, though during the long vacations spent in his Cevenol home he very often supplied the pulpit of some weary or absent pastor. Although frankly liberal in his advocacy of intellectual freedom and the rights of the Christian conscience, he never joined the liberal wing of the Reformed Church, nor took part in its councils, but always attended the pastoral counsels of the evangelical group, "intending to remain," he said, "until they showed him the door." Differ from his views as they might and often did, not one among them would show the door to a brother so

well beloved and trusted. When those questions of belief and polity arose which in the divided state of French Protestantism are so insistent, he threw the weight of his influence for conciliation. His desire was to establish a cordial understanding between the various groups of the Protestant family, to form a "center," which, mediating between the "left" and the "right," should save the integrity of the historic church of the French Reformation.

In 1900, at the age of sixty-one, Auguste Sabatier had reached the summit of his career. His home was a hearthstone of joy; his daughters were happily married, he was surrounded by young men of promise and even of achievement, whose minds and characters he had helped to form. In the ripeness of his powers he looked forward to long years of fruitful work. But unaware to himself an incurable disease had seized upon him. Though suffering much pain he attributed it to weariness, and promised himself that as soon as he had finished the first draft of the book upon which he was engaged,—the monumental work recently published—he would take some months of rest before revising it for publication. He planned a visit to his lately married daughter in Cairo, and a journey in the Holy Land, to Jerusalem and the shores of that Lake of Galilee on which, as he wrote his old friend, Professor Pédézet, he had lived so much. On January 25, 1901, he asked for three months' leave of absence, and for a few weeks longer, amid intolerable pain, he pushed forward his work upon the book which, as he believed, would clear away certain misconceptions as to the tendency of his "Philosophy of Religion." As he laid down his pen upon the final word of the book he said to his wife, "My work is done, I may die now." Yet in truth he did not anticipate dying; and the papers he left behind show that there was still much that he had planned to do.

He had only one more lecture to give before setting out upon the journey. It was February 11. He walked to his class room, gave the lecture with all his old enthusiasm,

and returning home lay down upon the bed from which he was never again to rise. At times excruciating suffering overcame him, and his groans could be heard through the house. Yet still he was not only brave but diligent. He continued to be interested in the questions of the day, read through the Greek Testament, which he knew by heart, and began a critical study of the *Odyssey*. This in the midst of such suffering that he was often heard to bless God for having showed man the way to invent morphine. As death drew near his spirit seemed more and more to rise above the limitations of sense, and to those around him he was a living interpretation of the Apostle's word, "The glorious liberty of the sons of God."

On Easter day he said to a friend, "I have thought much of all my friends, of those who have suffered, and especially of Christ. I have reflected much upon this arc of suffering which connects the pains of the lowest organic life with the anguish of the human mind and heart, and I have said to my God, 'Associate me with all that.'"

The morning of his death he said, "This is the most beautiful day of my life." Later he said, "Father, I leave in thy hands all whom I love and must leave behind. I have many things yet to do and say, but I commit myself to thee." When he knew himself to be dying he folded his hands and began to repeat the Lord's Prayer. His voice failing, his wife took it up; he followed with his eyes the motion of her lips, then said, "Father!" and was gone. It was April 21, 1901, the day on which he had expected to enter the earthly Jerusalem.

His death was little less than a national event. Opponents of his theological views united with those who agreed with him to do him honor. The newspapers of France and Switzerland dedicated long columns and even series of articles to the discussion of his service to the cause of religion. "The peer of John Calvin" many called him, and those who could hardly go so far admitted a no less high esteem of his

personal worth. The funeral services at Paris and Vallon were largely attended, and since then Protestants of all shades of belief have united in placing a monument over his grave.

This is not the place in which to enter upon a critical estimate of Auguste Sabatier's literary and theological work. Its purpose may be summed up in the words of his teacher, Professor Pédézet: "The great preoccupation of M. Sabatier was to establish the harmony of modern culture and religious faith"; and to this he was urged not more by his encyclopedic attainments than by his religious experience. "In him," says the same writer, "the theologian had disappeared and left the Christian."

The sense in which this is true is evident in his latest book, which, establishing the validity of Christian experience, yet contains a strong plea for a restatement of Christian dogma. For indeed the theologian was still full panoplied in Auguste Sabatier, though obscured by the effulgence of the Christian. It was for the practical needs of the church that he desired a rigidly scientific construction of theology, accurately reflecting the culture of the present day. He held the scientific spirit in reverence, as natural to man and the gift of God, but he held it as the servant of Christian experience.

Readers of his latest book find it closing with a quatrain from Corneille, the pertinence of which is perhaps not clearly evident. M. Frank Puaux, his friend from boyhood, tells us that Sabatier once said to him that when he came to the last word of his book he was irresistibly impelled, by a power moving in the depths of his heart, to write that stanza from Corneille's hymn. It is addressed to God, and closes with the words,

"C'est toi seul que je veux,"

and M. Puaux adds that he had never known Auguste Sabatier otherwise than "voulant Dieu"—desiring God.

In Memoriam

William Rupp, D.D.

BORN APRIL 17, 1837

DIED APRIL 3, 1904

PROFESSOR OF PRACTICAL THEOLOGY 1893-1904

EDITOR OF REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW 1897-1904



VII.

REV. WILLIAM RUPP, D.D.

BY REV. GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D.

The death of Dr. Rupp naturally is an occasion for a review of his life and a statement of his theological position. The place which he occupied in his own denomination, and the recognition which he received in scholarly circles of other churches, warrant the assertion that he reached a distinctive position in theological thought which merits analysis and study. He was a molding personality, whether he lived in a community as a pastor, taught in the theological seminary as professor, or conducted a theological review as editor. In his comparatively brief professorship he worked out a course of lectures on every subject belonging to the department of Practical Theology, besides lectures on Sociology and Ethics which were a most interesting feature of his course. Since 1871 he had been a regular contributor to the REFORMED REVIEW until he became its sole editor in 1897. As editor, both by his articles and his editorials, he has kept that periodical on a high plane and has won for it a large circle of readers. Since the establishment of the REVIEW, in 1849, no contributor has written so extensively for its pages as the last editor. It is both a tribute to his attainments in theology and an expression of regard for his profound scholarship, if in some measure we may delineate the life and thought of our departed colleague.

To comprehend the life of any man we must study his origin and training, the tendencies of the age in which he lived, and the character which he attained. These factors we shall consider in the life of Dr. Rupp.

He was born of German parents, in eastern Pennsylvania, in 1839. His family lived in humble circumstances. He

was reared as a member of the Reformed Church, confirmed by the Rev. William Helfrich, D.D. His father died while his son William was a boy, so that his home training was largely given him by his mother who was both a devout and a thoughtful woman. His pastor, Dr. Helfrich, was doubtless one of the greatest German preachers of Pennsylvania and must have made a deep impression on the receptive youth. In spite of many untoward circumstances young Rupp determined to get a classical education. He began his preparation for college in the Allentown Seminary, and after some years of public school teaching, he entered Franklin and Marshall College at Lancaster under the presidency of his late colleague Dr. Gerhart. In his college course he won the leading class honors and gave promise of a bright future. He continued his studies in the theological Seminary at Mercersburg under Professors Schaff, Wolf and Harbaugh. He maintained the high rank in scholarship in the seminary which he held in the college. To this day his fellow students bear witness to the indefatigable pursuit of his studies, and some of his professors lived to see their predictions of his future distinction realized.

The facts thus far cited in relation to his origin and training are significant for his later development. He was a Pennsylvania German, thus combining the German genius with the American spirit; he was Reformed, imbibing from his childhood the humble piety, the sound doctrines, and the irenic spirit of the church of the Heidelberg Catechism. He was poor, compelled to win his way at every step and to exercise every faculty of his mind in the struggle for life. He became an alumnus of a college and a seminary which stood for a distinctive philosophy and theology. At Mercersburg the dominant philosophy and theology of Germany were interpreted by Rauch, Nevin, Schaff and their successors. A controversy necessarily arose between the prevailing systems of the Puritans and Methodists and the Mercersburg system. Young Rupp, by nature a brilliant student and a contro-

versalist, mastered the fundamental principles of his school, began to expound them from the pulpit and in the *REVIEW*, and vigorously defended them against all antagonists.

In order to define more clearly Dr. Rupp's position we shall briefly point out the leading characteristics of the reigning theological systems in the United States, and those of the Mediatlional School of Germany, then represented by the representative theologians of the Reformed Church in this country. Such a comparison will also reveal the cause for antagonism between the different sections of American Protestantism and the leaders of Mercersburg theology.

The orthodoxy of the first half of the nineteenth century took the form of Calvinism or Arminianism. The theological battles were waged around the fire points of the one and the counterpoints of the other. Of the New England theology of this period, the late Dr. Lewis F. Stearns, of the Bangor Theological Seminary, writes: "The philosophical element in it had overshadowed the scriptural and spiritual elements. It had been too exclusively concerned with the questions of scholastic Calvinism. The controversies to which it gave rise had turned the thoughts of the theologians away from the essential and central facts of Christianity. The preaching had grown abstract, dry and powerless, and the people had become tired of it. In the reaction all theology fell into disrepute." (*Present Day Theology*, p. 533.) The central idea of the different denominational systems was God, conceived as Creator and Law-giver, holding men responsible for the observance of His laws, punishing the transgressors and rewarding the obedient. Christ was a necessity in the plan of salvation but only as an instrument, and not as having the source and power of salvation in Himself. He was made a substitute for the sinner; upon Him the penalty of sin was laid; by His suffering and death the justice of an angry God was satisfied. The benefits of Christ's death the sinner secured for himself by a struggle of soul until the peace of assurance dawned upon him with feelings of ecstatic joy.

The Church had little room in such a system. It was merely an association of the elect or of the converted who tried to win others by warning them against "the wrath to come," by awakening in them the feelings of anguish for sin and inducing the experience of forgiveness, and by signifying their conversion or regeneration by the rite of baptism. This sacrament had lost its meaning, while the Lord's Supper was turned into a mere memorial or "sign of what can exist as well without it." The conception of the Glorified Christ, present in His Church—in her ordinances and sacraments—and through the Holy Spirit constantly saving men and sanctifying them, was beyond the comprehension of the Christian preacher then. Christianity was regarded "as a system of abstract truths and of remote historical facts. Notions and propositions were made more of than the great spiritual realities for which they stand, the sacred events of nineteen hundred years ago more than the redemptive facts of to-day."

The idea of historical development was not understood, and when proclaimed, considered a dangerous heresy. To affirm that the Reformation was an outgrowth of the better tendencies of the Medieval Church, directed and formulated in the light of the New Testament, was decried as a step toward Romanism. There was no recognition of continuity in the nineteen centuries of Church history. The Roman Church was denounced as anti-Christian and the Protestant Church was said to be a restoration of the Church of the Apostles. Each denomination found its own peculiar doctrines, cultus and polity in the Bible, and was intolerant towards those who differed from its views. By a wrenching of Scripture texts from their historic connections, the baptist as well as the papist could prove his doctrines and beliefs as of divine origin. There could accordingly be no advance beyond the accepted orthodoxy, for that itself was a direct reproduction of the inspired Scriptures. While the traditions of Rome were so totally reprobate as to be worthy of condemnation only, a tradi-

tionalism ruled in Protestantism, which in its bigotry and intolerance, rivaled that of Catholicism.

This conception of Christianity was found in all the Protestant Churches of America, even in the German Lutheran and Reformed. Many of them had a nobler heritage but, in the unsettled conditions of a new country, they lost their birthright. The time came, however, when men became dissatisfied with the individualism, the emotionalism, and cold legalism of the Churches. They began to study the principles of the Reformation and of early Christianity and to reconstruct the doctrine and practices of the Church in the light of a sounder exegesis of the Bible, a better knowledge of the Fathers, and a keener sense for the religious needs of the age.

The new conceptions of Christ, the Church and of history came to this country by way of Germany from what was then known as the mediational theology. The mediationalists were the theological descendants of Schleiermacher and Neander. Some of them were influenced, also, by Hegel. They accepted Schleiermacher's conception of Christianity as being primarily a life in the community of Christians, rather than a doctrine, a cultus, or an institution. The Christian consciousness, which resulted from fellowship with the glorified Christ, was considered a source of Christian doctrine. Christianity unfolded itself in the world according to the processes of history—hence the theory of historical development. The confessions were regarded valuable as an expression of the Christian faith at the time of their composition. They had to be restated and revised, however, as the Church advanced in the understanding of truth in Christ and as the old formulas lost their meaning in a new age. Thus this school mediated between the traditional dogmas and the philosophy of the time. It endeavored to express old truths in new forms. The mediationalists, also, were advocates of union between the churches. In the light of their theory of development in the Church they did not denounce the medieval stage of Christianity as

anti-Christian, Babel, and totally depraved. They found it to represent the Church of Christ, though in many respects corrupt. It served a positive purpose, however, in the work of redemption. Consequently they sought the points of agreement, rather than of difference, between Romanism and Protestantism. The spirit of bitterness and denunciation, which prevailed between these two branches of the Church, waned. The patron saint of the mediationalists was the peace-loving and the union-seeking Melancthon. The same feeling began to exist between the different branches of Protestantism. A common basis, underlying all the churches of the Reformation, was recognized. Their watchword was, "in essentials unity, in doubtful matters freedom, in all things love." The representatives of this school had a high regard for the Church, the Sacraments, and the ordinances. These were the mediums of Christ by which He imparted Himself to His people. By a reaffirmation of the confessions, interpreted in the light of the present, and by an emphasis on the Church as the organ of Christ for the realization of His kingdom, the rationalism and the fanatical pietism of the eighteenth century were counteracted. The readers of the REVIEW will at once recognize the kinship between the mediational theology of Germany and the theology of Mercersburg. The three leading characteristics were the Christological idea, the theory of development, and the peculiar view of the Church and the Sacraments. These were the controlling principles in the thinking of Dr. Rupp. He comprehended them progressively and applied them in the solution of the theological problems which confronted him. That he was not in accord with the rigorous orthodoxy of the American churches, can now easily be understood. He shared the fate of his instructors and later of his colleagues. That he advanced, in the judgment of many of his brethren in the ministry, beyond the positions of the Mercersburg school, can only be understood by a careful study of his articles in the REVIEW. Such a study will convince the reader that he never broke with the past but log-

ically advanced from the position which he held in his early ministry to that which he occupied in his professorship. In fact the process of his own development is a counterpart of the development of theology in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

His articles in the *REVIEW* reveal two periods in his theological thinking. The first five articles were published from 1871 to 1875. Then follows a silence of eight years, broken by the first article of the second period in 1883. From that time on he contributed more than one article a year until his death. The eight years' silence was due largely to a failure of health. For several years he could not even read a book, much less write an article. But he continued to think on the fundamental questions of theology. When he began to write again he had developed the principles which lay in germ in the earlier articles. The formative principle of his theology, as well as that of the school to which he belonged, was the Christological. Under the influence of this idea he naturally differed from the Augustinian, the Calvinistic, the Lutheran, and the Arminian systems. He clearly states his position in an article on *Theological Problems*, 1888, *REF. QUART.*, in reference to his relation to other systems. "The shifting of the center of gravity of the theological system from the notion of the divine sovereignty, or of justification by faith, to the idea of the person of Christ, and the change from the conception of abstract being and power to that of absolute reason and love in the apprehension of God, must necessarily produce some alteration in the apprehension of every article or doctrine of Christian theology. A system of theology in which Christ is accepted as the absolute revelation of God, must necessarily prove to be somewhat different in all its parts from one in which He is regarded merely as a means for the accomplishment of an eternal decree of election, or as a means for the remedy of a certain disorder into which the world has fallen. Christian thought is becoming more and more Christological, and hence can no longer express itself in the custo-

mary formulas of the past. It is in this way that so many old and venerable dogmas have for this age become unsettled, and need to be reviewed and restated, in order that they may become true again and consistent in the new system of Christian thought that is growing up." In this paragraph he gives a reason for his differing from the older systems of theology and for his persistent effort to systematize the old truths in the light of a new principle. He believed that he found a more comprehensive principle for a theology than was found in the previous systems. In his view, the unrest and the changes in theology were occasioned, not by scepticism and rationalism, but "by the advancement of secular science, the progress of ethical culture, and the development of the religious life; while the impelling force of the whole movement, as we believe, is involved in the living impulse of the Christian faith itself." (REF. QUART., 1888, p. 31.)

What did he understand by the Christ idea in theology? He defines this idea a number of times in his writings. In an article on the Influence of the Christological Principle on the Doctrines of God, Man, and of Grace, REF. QUART., 1891, p. 46, which is a system of theology in embryo, he writes: "By the Christological principle we understand the idea of an eternal union of God and man in the person of Christ, as the medium of God's perfect self-communication and self-revelation to the world, and the consummation of all his ways and works. This implies on the one hand that Christ is the principle of the divine constitution of the world, and that in Him, as St. Paul says, all things consist or hold together. He is not an accident or an afterthought in the divine world-plan, but its central and determinative idea, the vital root as well as culminating head of all things. It implies, on the other hand, that Christ is the principle of all sound knowledge of God and of His ways and works. We can only know God aright in the light and inspiration of Christ." He then proceeds to show that God, as He is revealed in the historic life of Jesus, is not an omnipotent arbitrary sovereign, who uses

his creatures as his playthings, damning some and saving others; nor is He a monster whose wrath can be appeased and favor secured, like that of Moloch, by the sight of blood and torture, whether of beast or man. God in Christ is a God of absolute love and justice. "It follows, then, that the conception of love must be the determinative principle in any true or Christian doctrine of God. No doctrine of God would be Christian at all that is ruled by any other conception; as for instance the conception of sovereignty, of honor, or of glory."

The source for knowledge of God, according to this principle, is the historic Christ, as He lived among men, and as He now dwells in His glorified state in His Church and perpetually reveals Himself in the consciousness of believers. "The conception of God is derived, not from the feeling and ideas of the natural mind, whether as embodied in philosophy or religion, but from the self-revelation of God in Christ." (REF. QUART., 1889, p. 8.) He denied in the most emphatic language the sufficiency of the human reason for the comprehension of God. "The natural sense or consciousness of God, which is innate in all men, cannot be a sufficient source of a true knowledge of God and of His character, because the human mind is in an imperfect and abnormal condition. Hence in order to know God we must not look to the speculation of philosophers, nor to the religious ideas or practices of heathenism nor even to Judaism, but to the person and history of Christ." By the revelation of God in Christ the contents of the Old Testament itself is to be tested. Any conception of God therein revealed, which contradicts the spirit of Christ, is either imperfect or erroneous. Thus we can see how his conception of revelation, in and through Christ, delivered him from the old theory of verbal inspiration with its insoluble difficulties and prepared him for a critical study of the Bible without losing the foundations of his faith.

From the conception of revelation through Christ he also derived his view of the Christian consciousness as a source for

the knowledge of God. The glorified Christ is always present with His Church. He reveals Himself continually to His people, not by magical, but by rational and moral means. Christ, therefore, not only has revealed God once for all and enshrined His revelation in a book or delivered it to a hierarchy, while He Himself is absent in heaven, but "He is still revealing God in and through the Christian consciousness of the Church; and whatever is in harmony with the revelation of Christ that is divine truth, and whatever contradicts that revelation is error and falsehood." (REF. REVIEW, 1897, p. 4.) While the principles of Christ's kingdom—the idea of God, Man, and Salvation,—are found in the earthly teachings of Christ and His disciples, these become the actual possession of the believers in every age only by virtue of His perpetual presence in the Church and His revealing activity through the Holy Spirit in the mind and heart of men.

It follows, also, that there is progress in revelation and in the comprehension of revelation. The Bible becomes the word of God for the Church in any age in proportion as it is a living power in the mind and conscience of that age. Revelation, accordingly, is progressive, and the Church is free to appropriate the truths of science, philosophy, and heathen religions so long as that truth does not contradict the revelation of Christ. There is only one infallible standard of truth. It is not the Church, Roman or Protestant; it is not a book or a series of books; but it is the historical Christ revealing Himself by His word and spirit in the human heart. Since Christ did not reveal to His disciples a finished system of doctrine, nor present a series of propositions, which He termed a creed, but brought men into living fellowship with God and one another in His Kingdom, men will always be put to the necessity of formulating dogmas and confessions which will be at least a partial statement of the faith that is in them. But Dr. Rupp constantly intones the fact that definitions of the contents of Christian revelation and experience are only feeble efforts to express the unspeakable in formulas. "As a his-

torical science theology cannot at any period of time be perfect. * * * But if this be true then it follows that the theology of one period of time cannot be an ultimate standard for other periods. The confessions and doctrinal statements of the sixteenth century, for instance, possess no more binding authority for the Christian mind of the nineteenth century than do those of the fifth or tenth. They are always interesting or instructive as tidemarks of the best thought of the age in which they originated; therefore, to be carefully studied and treated with the highest respect; but they are not free from imperfections and errors, and have no right to be regarded as being invested with the character of ultimate authority over Christian thought." (REF. QUART., 1884, p. 501.) Views like these are a necessary consequence of the principle of historical development, which is itself an element of the Christological system.

True to the system taught in the Mercersburg School, he deduced his conception of the Church also from the Christocentric idea. In his first published article on "The Miracle of Pentecost in Relation to the Constitution of the Church," *Mercersburg Review*, 1871, p. 457, he defines his theory of the Church. He sums up his views of Christ's presence in the Church by a quotation from Nevin's "Mystical Presence," which reads as follows: "He (the Holy Ghost) constitutes the *form of Christ's* presence and activity in the Church, and the *medium* by which He (Christ) communicates Himself to His people." As Christ and the Holy Ghost are not sundered in the being of the Trinity, so neither are they sundered in the being of the Church. The Church is, therefore, not merely an association of men who interpret the Bible and attempt to live according to its precepts—a school of sound doctrine and pure morals. Nor is it an institution composed of officers, sacraments and ordinances, by means of which the powers of an absent Christ are mediated to men. It is rather a living organism, the body of the glorified Christ. "Through the Spirit, accordingly, the Church is filled with

the very life of Christ Himself. Through the spirit the life of Christ becomes the substance of the Church." This perpetual presence of Christ gives validity and efficacy to the sacraments and ordinances. The sacraments are called "the life-giving, saving ordinances, channels for conveying the life and grace of Christ over from Him to the Members of His mystical body." The general indwelling of the Spirit in the Church is in order to His special indwelling in the ordinances or institution of the Church, not the reverse. Men can only enter into living fellowship with Christ by union with the Church through the sacrament of baptism. "The objective medium or instrumental cause of regeneration, according to the Scriptures and the ancient faith of the Church, is the sacrament of baptism" and "vital union with Christ is formed in regeneration." His definition of baptismal regeneration in his early articles underwent significant modifications in his later articles. Comparing it with the operation of the sun in the natural world he continues, "so now there goes out from Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, a new spiritual principle of life, which lodges itself in the center of the human soul, imparting to it a new character, breaking the power of sin and producing new qualities and attributes within it. This is regeneration." (*Mercersburg Review*, 1873, p. 145.) Of the ordinances, like preaching, prayer or worship, the exercise of discipline and the power of the keys, he says: "All became energized (on the day of Pentecost) with the spirit and life; all came to be sacramental forces, living forms enshrining the powers of the supernatural world or new creation, and so efficacious means of grace for the salvation of men."

According to this view the Church was given an essential place in the Christian life. Men come to Christ not simply by reading the Bible, while standing aloof from the community of believers. Nor are meditation and prayer sufficient for salvation. Sects, who originated in an arbitrary manner and were not connected with the historic Church, are not sup-

posed to have the sacraments or the ordinances of Church and are bound to die. The sacraments are not an empty sign or a mere declaration of a gospel truth, but they are the organs through which the life of the glorified Redeemer is conveyed by the Spirit into the heart of the believer.

The school or individual, who propagated doctrines like these in the middle of the nineteenth century in the United States, would necessarily be charged with departure from the faith once delivered to the saints. The unique views of Christ, of historical development, and of the Church differed from the doctrines of the Roman, the Episcopal, the Lutheran, and, of course, from those of the Calvinistic and Arminian Churches. Dr. Rupp came into conflict with the reigning theologies of the times and was called a rationalist, a Catholic, a heretic, an Episcopalian, and a host of names in which one naturally takes little pleasure. Men, who did not occupy his standpoint or start from his premises, could not accept his conclusions. But their conclusion, that he was wrong because he did not agree with them or even with the systems of the past, did certainly not follow. Those, who accepted his premises and were members of his school, could not help but agree with his conclusions. His logic was almost irresistible. There may have been those, however, who, less logical than he was, would agree with his presuppositions but could not follow him to the end of his far-reaching arguments. They, also, lifted the finger of warning. In the latter part of his life, however, he proclaimed views from which many of those, who formerly agreed with him, differed. He did not occupy the same position, in some respects, which he held in the beginning of his career. Especially was his conception of the Church and the Sacraments called into question by the loyal adherents of the Mercersburg theology. In an editorial in the *REVIEW*, October, 1901, he significantly writes: "There have been changes in theology since the early sixties. And in some respects these changes have been in the way of a return to the position of the

fathers of the Reformation. This we believe to be especially true in regard to the doctrine of the sacraments."

If we understand aright the relation between his later position and his earlier, we find the reason for a change less in a renunciation of his former principles than in a change of emphasis and in the interpretation of those principles in the solution of new questions. In the articles of the seventies he emphasized continually the churchly idea and made the Christological idea subordinate to it. Afterwards he wrought out the Christological idea more consistently in relation to the various doctrines of theology and subordinated the idea of church to it. Yet he never ceased to regard the church as a divine institution, necessary for salvation. He could still say, "beyond the Church, no salvation." In an article *On the Purpose of the REVIEW*, in 1897, he writes: "This conception of the Church implies two practical consequences. The first of these is that the ordinances and the sacraments of the Church are real divine institutions and have a real bearing upon the development of the divine life in man * * *. The second is that the collective Christian consciousness, which belongs to the Church, is a source of authority in faith and doctrine for the individual Christian mind." The difference between his earlier and later conception of the Church we may express by saying that, according to the former view, the Church with her sacraments was creative of a new relation between man and God, while, according to the latter view, she declared and realized a relation that always existed ideally. This we may understand better by a brief consideration of the presuppositions upon which the theories of the Church, as held in his earlier and later life, rested.

In the early articles, not only the individual, but generic human nature, is regarded as so corrupt and depraved that man naturally is not related to Christ and is a part of a "massa perditionis." In the bosom of the fallen world the

new creation in Christ Jesus was embodied in the Church. Through the sacrament of Baptism, with its regenerating power, men are translated from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God. Baptism is a creative act by which man becomes what he was not before, either potentially or actually. On this point he modified his views. The reason for such modification was in what he regarded a deeper and more biblical conception of man's natural relation to Christ. The keynote of his thinking latterly was the dictum, "humanity by nature is constituted in Christ." Tertullian said, "The soul is naturally Christian." He found this doctrine in John's prologue and in the Pauline epistles. "There is the Pauline thought of Christ," he writes in 1901, *REF. REV.*, p. 552, "as the recapitulation of all things, on which Irenaeus laid so much stress—a thought which is possible only if we suppose that humanity is one solidaric organism, whose unific principle is the living idea which at last takes flesh and appears in the person of Christ. And how otherwise can we think of Him as the one in whom men are chosen before the foundation of the world—an idea which of course we must extend to all men, unless we would fall into the error of a double decree of predestination? But in any case it implies an ideal relation to Christ of those who are saved long before they are baptized." By this he did not imply that "an infant is by nature a member of the Church; and still less that it is by nature a member of the kingdom of God; for in order to membership in the kingdom of God there is required a moral process, of which the Church is the outward condition, through which the essential Christian becomes an actual Christian."

No one, however, felt more keenly than he that this change in the conception of man's natural relation to Christ involved a change in the significance of the Church and the Sacraments. For, in the article just quoted, he asks, "But does this, then, turn baptism into a mere empty, formal ceremony? We say, no; baptism has its meaning and its use in the economy of the

gospel. It declares to Christian parents that their children are God's children, and that they are responsible for their godly training. And it declares, or if the terms are preferred, it "signs and seals" to the children the fact that they are not their own, but belong to their faithful Savior, Jesus Christ, to whom they owe their lives as living sacrifices of thanksgiving. It is, therefore, an important help to that living faith through which alone the forgiving and saving grace of God in Christ can be realized, and the soul be enabled to be in *fact* what it is in *idea* through its constitutional union with Christ." This, he claims, is in harmony with Calvin's view of a sacrament, as found in the fourth book of the Institutes. This he, also, believed to follow logically from the Christ idea as he now interpreted it in the light of the New Testament. Whether this was an advance upon his former position, as some think, or a departure from it, as others think, it was in his mind, not only a logical consequence of a principle but a modification necessitated by the Christian consciousness of the age. "Our concern is not to lessen people's respect for the sacraments by any means, but rather by showing their true nature, to make continued respect for them possible in this age of universal intelligence. And we are, therefore, concerned to get rid of that *opus operatum* theory which teaches that the sacraments impart grace in consequence of their mere performance, which we hold to be unscriptural, unreasonable and unethical, and certain to be rejected by the age in which we live." (REVIEW, 1901, p. 555.) Space does not permit us to enlarge on the changes in his thinking. Let it be sufficient, if we have, in a measure, explained the reason for his change of view and have shown why Dr. Rupp not only differed from the older theologies of other churches, but from some of the positions at one time so rigorously expounded by the Mercersburg School.

He was not, however, at any time drifting on the currents of the "new theology." While he accepted many of its prin-

ciples, he stood in judgment on it, which he was capable of doing because of the foundations he laid at Mercersburg. He felt that in the new theological tendency there was not a proper account made of the Church and, accordingly, it tended toward Unitarianism. Nor do many of the adherents of the new school comprehend the Christological idea in the way he expounded it. He did not hold the low views of Christ's personality found in current literature, though he might not be able to accept all the definitions of the Greek theologians on the subject. Yet he was far more in agreement with Athanasius in his conception of Christ than with most of the teachers of the new school. His criticism of Ritschlianism, in the January REVIEW, 1897, shows how clearly he differentiated his position from some of the fundamental principles of that school. He was too much of a philosophical theologian and had too much confidence in the power of the mind to know the essence, and not merely the phenomena, of things, to accept the anti-metaphysical standpoint of the Ritschlians. With a keen insight into the consequences of such a position he says, "The idea of anything supernatural or miraculous in the origin of Christianity must be given up, because such an idea implies at least some knowledge of the metaphenomenal. Most of the dogmas of Christianity, like those of the Trinity and of the Incarnation, are illegitimate, because they transcend the limits of knowledge; and they came into Christianity under the influence of Greek philosophical ideas * * *. Now Ritschlianism is doubtless wrong in denouncing all dogmas and in rejecting the application of all philosophy in theological thinking. Theology and philosophy are inseparable. We cannot think on religious problems at all without employing philosophical forms and categories. * * *. How long will people believe in Christianity when they no longer care for its doctrines? How long will they accept the phenomena of Christianity when they are in doubt as to the underlying reality? Here, manifestly, there is a danger threatening the

Church which the rightful persons ought carefully consider" (January REVIEW, 1897). In the face of these utterances no one, who has any regard for his reputation for scholarship or for honesty, will call Dr. Rupp a Ritschlian. But he would not condemn Ritchlianism on the ground of public rumor as so many men are wont to do. He studied the system, was free to acknowledge its virtues and to point out its defects.

This analysis of Dr. Rupp's thinking would not be complete without a reference to his rationalism. His friends and foes have discovered a rationalistic tendency in his writings. If rationalism means that men acquire knowledge of God and the world by observation and speculation merely, and that any religious phenomenon or fact that cannot be explained by the human understanding cannot be accepted, then he was one of the last men of this generation guilty of that accusation. Probably the best refutation of such a charge is a quotation from some of the many statements on this subject in his articles. "By the Christologic principle we understand the idea that Christ is the absolute medium of divine revelation and therefore the absolute source of theological knowledge. The ultimate source is not the reason, nor the Church, nor the Bible, but Christ." "We can only know God and man aright in the light and inspiration of Christ." "The truth with which theology deals is not the product of the reason either as intuitive or discursive; but it is a gift of revelation, something given or laid down—*positum*." How a rationalist could make such affirmations those can best explain who have ranked the Doctor in that class.

If rationalism, however, means that reason has a place in religion and has a right to attempt a rational explanation of revelation, then he was a rationalist of the first order. For the supreme motive of his life, which made him in a sense a martyr to the truth, was his effort to give a reason for the faith that was in him. Again and again he writes, "we be-

lieve in order that we may know." Several quotations will throw light on his view of the relation between faith and reason. "We believe that Christianity is in the highest sense rational and that the human mind enlightened by the spirit of the gospel, is capable of comprehending their rationality and hence we believe that Christianity will ultimately justify itself in all its parts to the reason and conscience." "The ultimate goal of Christian thought is the perfect solution of all problems, and the perfect reconciliation of faith and knowledge, of revelation and reason." He did not believe that one man could bring about such a reconciliation. "For any individual thinker to suppose himself to be able to answer all questions and to solve all doubts would indeed be in the highest degree presumptuous; but it would be equally presumptuous for any one to suppose that what was impossible for him personally must be impossible, also, for the general mind of the age or for the universal mind of mankind. The universal mind of mankind may be trusted, at least, to solve all the questions that it can raise."

His confidence in the powers of the Christian reason to comprehend the contents of divine revelation explains the dominant purpose of his life. As a pastor he lived the life of a professor, spending twelve hours a day in his study. He studied science, philosophy, history and theology with one aim in view—the reconciliation of faith and reason. His students will never forget the light that shone out of his study window in the seminary building for six nights a week until ten and eleven o'clock. His mind was constantly occupied with the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. No astronomer ever studied the heavens more faithfully, no explorer ever scanned the horizon more keenly, no conqueror ever waged his battle more energetically, no prospector dug more patiently, than Dr. Rupp sought Truth. He devoted all his energies to the study of eternal principles, the truths of the kingdom of God. He was preeminently a philosophical theologian. He was fitted by

nature and training for that work. He lacked the poetic vein, the lively social disposition, the irrepressible wit and humor—all of which he did not despise in others. He was not a revivalist on the pulpit like Moody nor an orator like Beecher. He was a teacher at all times and the work he accomplished in his pastorates, the influence that he wielded upon the intelligent men of his congregations, the students he turned toward college, the rank he took among his colleagues in a community, all bear testimony that he knew how to rightly divide the word of truth, "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed."

It is not an easy matter for a preacher to leave the pulpit and occupy a professor's chair. Dr. Rupp was about fifty-three years old when he was elected professor of practical theology. He commanded the respect and admiration of his students from the first hour in the classroom. He laid hold of every subject with the hand of a master and left the impression that he might almost with equal ease fill any other chair in the institution. He made his students think. He taught them how to deal with fundamental principles and reach independent conclusions. Having done so much thorough work himself and having gained a standpoint and evolved a system of his own, he met all questions which were asked him in an open, frank, and positive manner. He was not afraid to say, "I don't know." He knew the limitations of knowledge. He was fearless in the expression of his convictions—perhaps frank to a fault. He probably did not know what it meant to be politic. On this account, however, he won the confidence of his students. Men, who opposed him, would be free to express their admiration for his honesty, thoroughness, and simplicity of expression. He never learnt the art of evasion or of concealing his thoughts in words. When he wrote his style was so lucid and his logic so clear that he could not be misunderstood.

His work in the *REVIEW*, as editor, was in more than one sense a labor of love. He loved it because it gave him an

opportunity to present the fruit of a lifetime of study to his fellow-ministers, his students, and the intelligent laity of the Church. He loved it because he felt that he was carrying on the work of his great predecessors from Nevin to Apple. He loved it because he could through its pages take part in the solution of the great questions of the hour. In his articles one reads scarcely a dull page, or an irrelevant line. Every subject, on which he writes, he expounds with a breadth and depth of view that compels attention and quickens thought. There is a pulse and vigor in his writings that will keep them alive long after his body has turned to dust. For a clear presentation of the problems which attracted the attention of theologians during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, we know of nothing more satisfactory than his *REVIEW* articles. The young preacher will find his time well repaid if he spends a year in studying them.

But we have already transgressed our limits in the attempt to present an outline of his theological views. To do justice to his work one would need the space of a volume rather than of an article. Time does not permit us to speak of his *Ethics*, his *Sociology*, and of the theological doctrines in detail such as the atonement, grace, inspiration, and justification. He had fresh and original views on all these subjects. He interpreted all of them in the light of the Christological idea. We have written this estimate of the man and his work with the esteem and affection which he awakened in us as a colleague for five years. Many an evening we sat together in his study, and many an hour we walked side by side, and never was he so happy as when he could discuss with a sympathetic friend the subjects which constantly absorbed his thought. Verily he lived in the transcendental realm. Never was a man surer of the eternal life, of the objective reality of the kingdom of God than he. But constituted as he was, he grasped these eternal verities with the reason and the conscience more than with the feelings. Yet they became life in him. For in his

endeavor to realize the ideals of the Christ in the individual and in society, he made himself a living sacrifice for the truth. He has joined his teachers and his predecessors in the heavenly world. He has left in the hearts of his students, colleagues and friends an influence which will be more highly prized as years roll by.

In Memoriam

Emanuel Vogel Gerhart

D.D., LL.D.

BORN JUNE 13, 1817

DIED MAY 6, 1904

EDITOR OF MERCERSBURG REVIEW 1857-1861

PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY 1868-1904

The University

University of California

Library

1911

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

VIII.

REV. EMANUEL VOGEL GERHART, D.D., LL.D.

BY REV. ELLIS N. KREMER, D.D.

The writer has been asked to prepare a memorial to Dr. Gerhart for the October number of the REVIEW. There are reasons why this should be a pleasant duty. Dr. Gerhart was a life-long friend of our parents, a welcome and an honored guest in the home, and one for whom in his times of affliction the family prayers were offered. He was the instructor of our youth and in the college and seminary we learned from him lessons which can never be forgotten. He always commanded our reverent admiration and our affection and we were favored by a close fellowship during the past sixteen years when, as members of the same classis, we worked together. For the last six years our relations were closer in the work of the Theological Seminary. Nevertheless we approach the task with great misgivings. We feel our inability for such a work, and regret the necessary haste with which it must be done.

It is important however that, while the fact of the departure of one so prominent in the Church is still near in time, a testimonial to his memory should appear in the publication which always commanded his support, to the earlier numbers of which he was a contributor, and in the pages of which we find so many contributions from his pen. To be early done this must be quickly done. The work must be one of memory rather than one made by a careful examination of his productions and the record of his labors as they are to be found in the archives of the Church.

Some men are brilliant teachers early in life. Their powers develop quickly and while yet young they contribute to the stock of knowledge which is of permanent value. They

surprise us by a wealth of information and mental grasp which is unlooked for save from those of riper years. Such men, as a rule, do not become old. Either their powers have been too rapidly developed or they have made too heavy a demand upon their strength. Other men reveal their greatest powers in advanced life. Maturing slowly, like the oak, they surprise us by their vitality of body and mind when younger men give up the struggle and end their career. Dr. Gerhart was of the latter class. And yet he combined in a remarkable degree the qualities of both. When young he held eminence of position among the older men of the Church, and was marked by such gravity, dignity and depth of thought that he seemed older than his years; at the same time he always showed such freshness and vigor that he ever seemed young. It is said that students of other institutions and ministers of other churches, who became acquainted with him through his "Institutes" and other late productions, were amazed to find that he had reached his three-score years and ten. Always old and always young he was deliberate and grave from the beginning of his career; he was hopeful and bright to its end. He was never so young as to withhold the respect which is due to age; never so old as to forget the interest with which the rising generation must be regarded or to restrict its right to fight its own battles and to carve out its own future. Those who sat with him in our synods will remember the pleasure he manifested at the abilities and successes of younger members of the body. The young always found in him a patient, sympathetic and appreciative counsellor and friend.

Dr. Gerhart was a great teacher. All of his pupils speak of him as such. In his room the class was always able to show what it knew, and always left the room knowing more than when it entered. He was a good questioner. His questions were not put so as to suggest the answer, but they were so clearly put that the import of them was plain; and if by the slowness of the pupil the question was not grasped his patience seemed inexhaustible, nor did he leave a rankling wound by

a cutting remark at dullness of comprehension. He did not call forth the applause of his students by flashes of brilliancy; but his words were so well weighed that there was no need to correct them and seldom, if ever, to modify them. He never lost the main issue by divergence. So logical was his thinking, so careful his statements, that when he did digress, as he often did, he never failed to return and take up the subject where he left it, and then carry it on to a proper finish. Into many a pleasant by-path did he lead us, but always brought us back to the main road.

To the impatience of youth his reasoning seemed at times needlessly formal and his repetitions excessive, but we learned to see that to these we owed the clear apprehension of truth we gained under his instruction, the importance of exactness in statement, and the many phases in which one truth would present itself to the mind. If we were in doubt as to what we were taught we could not ascribe it to the carelessness of expression or vagueness of thought on the part of our teacher. He moved along in such a plain path and step by step, that he never could have covered a false step by glittering generalities or phosphorescent flashes of verbiage, even if he could have tried to do so. In the theological seminary at Mercersburg we sat under the fascinating power of one of the most eloquent of teachers, the impression of whose poetical diction and glowing pictures, still live with us.* In his department he was a master. Dr. Gerhart was of another type, and the subject of his instruction called for a different method. We do not compare invidiously the characteristic gifts and attainments of our teachers, but remember with gratitude the fact that we enjoyed the advantage of such marked and helpful variety. We find also that, though of a different type, the thought and expression of Dr. Gerhart made a no less lasting impression.

In a sermon on the "Good Shepherd" Dr. Gerhart said, "The world never gives itself for another, but destroys an-

* Dr. E. E. Higbee.

other for itself." "The world is incapable of appreciating the spirit of the Christian; it is foolishness to the world. For the true spirit of the Christian is giving, not taking." Thus he expressed in a "nutshell" that which is capable of almost endless elaboration, but he left the elaboration to the hearer in whose mind the terse saying found lodgment. On a Good Friday he presented our Lord standing before His persecutors wearing the crown of thorns. Calm and deliberate in delivery he yet made us see in our minds the Saviour majestic in suffering. The preacher and the scene are with me as I write. He then said, "the ground was cursed. 'Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth for thee.' But we see Jesus bearing the thorns." The strength of Dr. Gerhart's teaching, however, lay not so much in such vivid pictures as in his reasoning and the summing of his statements in terse and compact sentences which yielded more than they conveyed on the instant because they compelled reflection. To this is to be added his frequent and forceful use of scripture.

The excellence of a teacher consists not alone in his learning, nor his power to impart and to draw out from the pupil the expression of that which he has learned, nor his discipline, by which he develops the latent powers of the pupil; but it is found also in his personality. The student studies the man as well as the book. Brought directly under his influence by the close relation of teacher and pupil he is both consciously and unconsciously moulded by the character of his teacher. Dr. Gerhart held towards his students the place of a parent. His counsels were parental in kind. Sometimes they were given to the whole class, and at other times they were personal and private. He emphasized the significance of manhood, of personal purity of life, and, without saying much, spoke to the class on personal virtue in such terms, and with such earnestness, that the occasion and words we have never forgotten. When he administered reproof he did so privately. He regarded the self-respect and pride to which he appealed in his pupil. His thoughtful consideration for the feelings of the

student, accompanied by the positive assertion of authority and earnest admonition, made a permanent impression for good on those to whom he thus spoke. Rich in experience, for he had been pastor and missionary before he began his long service in the Church as an educator, he was able to give wise counsel for all positions in life. Some of his advice which seemed to his students to bear on things of little moment were in after experience found to be the very things we remembered and of far-reaching meaning. What seemed to us to touch but the external we found to contain a principle of conduct which reached in many directions.

Prominent among other characteristics were his fidelity and self-control. Whatever he taught us concerning these virtues found abundant illustration in his own life. He never shirked a duty; was never negligent in preparation for it; and never asked of us that which he himself did not do. When absent from the institution, and the train on which he returned was too late for the stage, he would walk from Greencastle to Mercersburg, between ten and eleven miles, rather than miss his appointment. In the classis, where because of his many duties he might well have been excused, he did his full share of work with the same conscientious fidelity as in the Theological Seminary. In whatever position he was placed he could be relied upon and he never put off his work till the last moment.

We have frequently seen Dr. Gerhart placed in trying positions, but never saw him lose his self-control. Twice we saw him in exceedingly trying positions, when no one could have blamed him for sharp rejoinder or indignant protest. But he bore himself in harmony with his own statement quoted above, and showed that the spirit of the Christian is one of giving, not taking. His rights were waived, and knowing as we did the deep feelings which surged through him, and seeing the masterful way in which he held himself in check, surrounded as he was by those who would have sympathized with any burst of feeling to which he could have given expression,

we learned a lesson never to be forgotten. In controlling himself he controlled others.

As a teacher Dr. Gerhart was happy in his illustrations. His logical mind and his sense of the fitness of things led him to always take his illustrations from life. Seidom, if ever, did we know him to use illustrations from the mechanical or inorganic except to show their insufficiency to illustrate that which was in a different order from themselves. So fully did he impress this upon his pupils that it became a characteristic mark of the teaching or preaching of those who came from under his instruction. Dr. Gerhart's teaching was objective and positive. He held that the objective is the true basis for right subjectivity. He did not rise from feeling and experience to the objective, to the reality of Divine fact, but held that they were the true source of right feeling and experience. As the Gospel is apprehended through faith, and the heart is opened to Him who stands at the door and knocks, the heart itself will glow with the fire of love. It was not what we put into the "Word" but what it put into us which made it able to "make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in Jesus Christ." He taught positively the facts of revelation. On the subject of the Church and sacraments, the promises of the Gospel, faith, etc., he charged us to always hold and teach the positive view. The Divine appointment of the sacraments, the grace communicated thereby to the believing subject, the obligation resting on those who enjoyed them, these we had authority to declare. The negative, or the consequences following their nonobservance, we could leave in the hands of the merciful God who gave us the sacraments. This, of course, he applied to those who cannot receive them; not to us who acknowledge the obligation to submit to them and had the opportunity so to do. If from his teaching, therefore, others would deduce by logical inference the damnation of the unbaptized, or the unchurched, that was their own deduction, not his. His mind was great enough to grasp the full posi-

tive affirmations of the Gospel and he proclaimed them fearlessly; but it was humble enough to bow before the mystery of a mercy which is "from everlasting to everlasting," and not to affirm that which he had not been commissioned to proclaim. It was just here that Dr. Gerhart was at times misunderstood by some who belonged to the same camp; but it was here that we felt him to be especially strong.*

Positive as he was, he was equally liberal. Although he had passed through a period of conflict when the Reformed Church had to defend herself against old friends and new foes, we never knew him to pass severe judgment upon others. He never taught us that we were to be merely ministers of the Reformed Church, but ministers of the Lord Jesus Christ. This was equally true of our other professors. He had an affinity for all ministers of Christ, and while his teaching brought out the strength of our own position, it was done not in the spirit of a partisan, but of broad liberal recognition of others.

Christianity with Dr. Gerhart was not doctrine alone, nor life alone, but both. He recognized the rights of the human reason, and appealed to it by his own logical presentation of truth. He held "fast to the form of sound words," but did not measure the Christian life by doctrine. He held the two together. Knowing that thought determines the life, he yet knew that life is more than thought. He emphasized therefore the importance of sound doctrine, and he developed the union of believers with Christ. Both principles received their due treatment, not by balancing one against the other, but by

* We never sat under a teacher who so frequently called forth opposition to his thought as did Dr. Gerhart. This was because of the far-reaching significance of his statements and the terse form in which they were put. They could not be grasped without reflection. They compelled investigation, and when thus investigated the mind held a clear conception of an important truth, which would be more clearly held because the process of reaching it was the pupil's own, based on the suggestion of the teacher, and reached by the application of his method of reasoning. It was this characteristic among others which made Dr. Gerhart such a successful instructor.

presenting them as component parts of the whole truth. His system was not therefore a fragmentary arrangement of separate truths; but a growth. Externally, and because of his logical mind, his lectures on dogmatics did seem at first to be more of an arrangement of parts, than, *e. g.*, Harbaugh's lectures which we used as a text-book, and which were written with poetic fervor; but this was only in appearance. One could soon see that they were informed by one principle, and by this, not as it had been discovered by the teacher or invented, but as it had taken hold of his own great mind and heart through the word of God, and faith which is in Jesus Christ. Sitting under his instruction one could well perceive what has been seen and expressed by one of the reviewers of his institutes, one who does not accept the principle of his book, who says:* "It is informed with reverence for the holy themes discussed, and a devoutness of spirit which convinces his readers that the author's soul has found nourishment in the doctrines he formulates, and that he thinks with the heart as well as with the head." It was this fact that made him such a forceful teacher, and made his calm reasoning move the soul as by the fire of eloquence.

Dr. Gerhart lived through the educational movement of the Reformed Church in the United States. He was a pupil of Mayer and Rauch, was a member of the high school at York, moved with the institution to Mercersburg, and lived to see the growth of our institutions in this land and in Japan, a larger fulfillment of hope than any of our fathers could have prophesied.

Four months before his death there were yet living three men who were students of the High School, the mother of all our educational institutions. These were Elder Jacob Heyser, who died in Chambersburg, Pa., January 17, Dr. Gerhart himself, and Elder Rudolph F. Kelker, the last living representative of that body of students, of whom when the roll is properly completed, the Church of the coming generations

* Professor Benjamin B. Warfield.

will think with peculiar affection and pride. The last named lives in his home in Harrisburg, where he has always lived, in the full possession of his mental faculties, and with sufficient physical vigor to enable him to be actively useful. The first person to greet him when he alighted from the stage in York was Emanuel Gerhart. This friend of his youth and of his later life has preceded him to a "better country" where he waits to give him a warmer welcome to a better fellowship.

Having been connected so early with our school of the prophets Dr. Gerhart took a long, active and honorable part in the great intellectual and doctrinal movement which gave Mercersburg a name in the universities of Europe. Our professors and writers, and our institution, received there honorable recognition and were better known than in their own country.

The distinctive theological system with which Dr. Gerhart was allied was called "Mercersburg Theology." The movement thus named was the struggle of the Reformed Church-life, amidst conditions and influences altogether different from those in which it had its birth (and some of which were hostile to the spirit of the church) to assert itself according to its own idea and law. The movement reached out in cultus and government as well as in doctrine. It embraced far more than could be expressed by the term "Mercersburg Theology." The name given to it was a term of controversy and was used by some to represent certain features of the movement which were not acceptable to the whole Church. The movement itself was broader than the name as thus used, and gave to the Church the Order of Worship endorsed by the General Synod, and later the Directory of Worship, adopted by the constitutional number of classes, and thus placed by the side of the venerable Heidelberg Catechism as one of the ordinances of the Church. Among the results of this movement may be cited, the restoration of the Catechism to its proper place in the Church, the recognition of the Church year as

originally observed in the early life of the Church, the collects, offices, and forms of worship as they now stand in the Directory, and the emphasis now properly given to the Apostles' Creed. These features stand to-day as a bulwark against the tide of loose and independent thought which always threatens the Church in one form or another, and we may well rejoice that so much has been preserved out of the storms and dissensions which at one time threatened our very existence. Together with these is a system of theology which has been wrought out by our own men. In all this work Dr. Gerhart was continuously active, and it is his peculiar honor to have been spared to present in a systematic form his own conception of this movement as it laid hold of his mind and heart. It is also to his praise to have produced in the evening of his life a work "which bears throughout the marks of a long-continued, careful and conscientious labor," "conspicuous for philosophical depth of thought."*

We cannot pass under review Dr. Gerhart's "Institutes of the Christian Religion." This work is before the public in printed form, and should be more generally circulated in the Church. It is a fitting memorial to his patient labor, his distinguished ability, and his intelligent faith. It appeals to the heart as well as the head and will call forth from every careful reader praise to Him Who gave to His servant strength and years to finish his work.

Dr. Gerhart's work as a teacher was in so many departments, extended over so many years, and the number of his publications was necessarily so small, compared with the important positions he filled, that it is difficult to assign him his specific position among the leaders of thought in the American Church. He stands however as the first American author who has published a Christological or Christocentric Dogmatics. What was wrought by a number of writers in articles upon many subjects of faith and cultus Dr. Gerhart has completed in the book already named. He himself was both a contribu-

* Dr. Benj. B. Warfield.

tor to and a product of the great movement of thought which he has reproduced and preserved in his Institutes. In this work however he does not simply copy or record the thoughts of others. By his own patient and constructive labors he has produced a system of theology ruled by the great fact of revelation as it laid hold of his own mind and heart: "No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." It is by this work that his position among the teachers of his generation will be fixed by the judgment and appreciation of the public. Great as this may be he will always hold a higher position in the affection and esteem of the large number who have come under the influence of his teaching. But his position may safely rest on his Institutes. Such a work will always be needed because of the ever-recurring attacks upon the fundamental truth of Christianity, the person and work of our Lord Jesus Christ, as they are revealed in the Scriptures and confessed in the Apostles' Creed.

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

MY FOUR RELIGIOUS TEACHERS. By H. Clay Trumbull. Cloth. Pages 128. Price, \$1.00. Philadelphia, The Sunday School Times Company, 1903.

This book is a tribute of appreciation by a grateful pupil to his four religious teachers. Due acknowledgment is made in the preface of the earliest religious instructions and impressions received from his mother and his pastors. The four religious teachers, of whom Dr. Trumbull writes in particular, were "Men of God under whose instruction and influence he was providentially brought at the time he was entering on the Christian life, and whose teaching have largely shaped his religious course and modes of thought." Two of them, Drs. Chas. Finney and Horace Bushnell, have a national and even an international reputation. Their words and works have been recorded in extensive biographies. Yet when one reads the personal testimony of their influence on so distinguished a pupil as Dr. Trumbull, new light is cast upon their personalities, their characters and their methods. Less widely known, though not of less worth and fidelity in their callings, were David Hawley, the Hartford City missionary, and Dr. Elias Beadle, pastor of the Pearl Street Congregational Church at Hartford. The several sketches are interspersed with anecdotes and reminiscences taken from Dr. Trumbull's personal acquaintanceship with these distinguished men. He could see them and hear them from an original standpoint, and he has accordingly drawn a living picture with fresh color and inspiring force. The book is written in an engaging style and published in a most attractive form. A portrait of the subject precedes each sketch.

The author emphasises the fact that none of the four men "was trained in and bound by the tenets of any distinctive and recognised school of denominational theology." Yet "all these teachers were earnest, devoted, evangelistic soul-lovers in God's service." Such training he considers a providential preparation for his life-work which was largely undenominational in its character. For he has since labored as city missionary, army chaplain, in the Sunday-school work, and as a non-denominational religious editor. God prepares every workman in a specific way for his appointed work. Blessed is that man whose lot is cast in the formative period of his life among teachers of inspiring

and molding personalities like those of Dr. Trumbull were. The reading of the book stirs one to new ambition for service and to a keener appreciation of the undying influence of a noble life upon those in whose presence it is lived.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D.

NEW LIGHT ON THE LIFE OF JESUS. By the Rev. Professor Chas. Augustus Briggs, D.D., D.Litt. 12mo. Cloth. Pages 196. Price, \$1.20 net. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.

Whether or not one can always agree with Dr. Briggs, it is impossible not to recognize him as an earnest seeker after the truth, and as bringing to this search ample scholarship. This volume affords new and interesting evidence on these points. A glance at the table of contents shows that in the several chapters which make up the book, he does not propose writing a new life of the Saviour, but rather to throw new light upon the chronological order of the events belonging to the Lord's life on earth. As is well known, the widely used Harmony of the Gospels by Robinson is based on the order of the Fourth Gospel, —an order which modern criticism has shown to be unreliable, and which Dr. Briggs frankly tells us he "abandoned many years ago." Likewise he has given up the order followed by Mark upon which so many of the Lives of Jesus in modern times are based. Instead of these he has adopted that of the earliest harmonist, Tatian, and in so doing found a flood of new light dispelling clouds that had rested on the gospel records.

In this light he discovered that "there was a Galilean Ministry of Jesus prior to the arrest of John the Baptist, and that while five pairs of the Twelve were absent on a mission in Galilee, Jesus with James and John, one pair of the Twelve, was carrying on His ministry in Jerusalem, and at intervals with another pair, Thomas and Matthew, in Perea; and so the order of the ministry became altogether different from that presupposed in the modern Harmonies and Lives of Jesus." In the author's view, the consequences of this arrangement put the material of the Gospels in place "with so much ease, so much propriety, and with such simplicity and beautiful harmony," that he submits his discovery with confidence to Christian scholars and the Christian public.

This notice of Professor Brigg's book can not undertake following in detail the argument pursued by him in his successive chapters to establish his contention. It must suffice to say that the new light certainly allows the events of Jesus' life to be arranged in a simple and orderly and generally very satisfactory chronological scheme; that it solves some of the perplexing problems of the Gospels which the earlier schemes could not unravel; and that it bridges the chasm between the Synoptist and the Gospel according to St. John in a way that will be

heartily welcomed by students of the evangelical narratives. The book may not solve all the difficulties of the variations of the four-fold record we have of the "Life of Lives," but it is surely a valuable contribution in that direction. The REVIEW commends the volume to the earnest reading and consideration of Bible students.

A. S. WEBER, D.D.

BABEL AND BIBLE. By Dr. Friedrich Delitzsch, Professor of Assyriology in the University of Berlin. 8vo. Cloth. Pages 163. Chicago, The Open Court Publishing Company.

This volume contains the two lectures on the significance of Assyriological research for religions in general, and the Christian religion in particular, which have created such a stir the past year in the theological world. The translation from the German is very satisfactorily done by Thomas J. McCormick and W. H. Carruth. The nature of these lectures is so well known by all readers of current Biblical and theological literature that it is unnecessary to dwell upon the same in this notice. The value of this edition of them is greatly enhanced by the numerous illustrations contained in its pages, and by the consideration given by Dr. Delitzsch to those who have criticised his views. In this form these lectures are by far the most valuable of any that in the English language have come under our eye, and those desiring to have them will not err in procuring this edition.

A. S. WEBER, D.D.

THE BIBLE AND BABYLON. By Dr. Eduard Koenig, Professor of Philosophy and Theology in the University of Bonn. 12mo. Cloth. Pages 64. Burlington, Iowa, German Literary Board.

This little book written in excellent spirit has already passed to a ninth edition. It acknowledges that a thrilling interest attaches to the discoveries made by the excavations of recent years in the vicinity of Babylon, and that they furnish a well-defined background for the narratives and revelations of the Bible. It vigorously protests, however, against the drawing of "sweeping conclusions from the most meagre, and uncertain premises," such as have been drawn by "the *injunctious* of some enthusiastic students." The reference of course is to Dr. Delitzsch and his followers. In the preface of the translator, Dr. Charles E. Hay, it is said, that it is well that the most extreme positions of Assyriologists have been so distinctly stated by so zealous and competent a scholar as the author of "Babel and Bible." Those lectures have challenged attention and focused interest upon the central questions at issue, and Dr. Koenig had done equally well in pointing out the fallacies of too hasty deductions, and in indicating the true relations of the

knowledge from Babylon to the old familiar truth of the Bible. Dr. Koenig's calm, critical estimate of Delitzsch's second lecture will be warmly welcomed by many who are not in a position to follow the discussion in all its detail. He does not believe the excavations along the Euphrates to constitute the grave for the peculiar prerogatives of the Bible in the history of religion, but affirms the survival of the Bible in its unique position and pre-eminence. Hence the title he has given to his interesting brochure.

A. S. WEBER, D.D.

HISTORY OF THE FIRST REFORMED CHURCH, LANCASTER, PA., 1736-1904.
Authorized by the Consistory. Prepared by Rev. W. Stuart Cramer.
Vol. I. Lancaster, Pa., Wickersham Printing Co., 1904.

This little book is a souvenir of the Semi-Centennial Celebration, February 14, 1904, of the consecration, by the First Reformed Church of Lancaster, of the building in which they still worship. More than half of the book is taken up with Dr. Henry Harbaugh's centenary discourses, which were delivered on October 11 and 12, 1851, on the occasion of the one hundred and fifteenth anniversary of the building of their first church. These discourses are based upon the early records of the church, and are a carefully prepared history of the congregation, in Dr. Harbaugh's best manner. They are carefully and fully annotated by the editor from later sources of information, not at hand fifty years ago. The second part is a history prepared by Rev. John A. Peters, at the request of Lancaster Classis, and covers the period from 1847 to 1878. The third part is by the editor, the present assistant pastor of the congregation, and covers the pastorates of Revs. John A. Peters, D.D., and John M. Titzel, D.D., from 1878 to 1904. The book also contains a list of the pastors of the church since its founding, the consistories from 1848 to 1904 and the organists during the last fifty years, of which there have been only eight.

It would be well if there were more books of this kind published. In the archives and records of our old congregations there is much valuable matter hidden away that would be not only interesting, but full of instruction and profit to the men and women of to-day and coming time. Our people ought to know more than they do of the struggles and trials of their fathers, and of the spirit that moved them in the work that they were called upon to do for the Church in this new land. The book ought to have a large circulation not only among the members of the congregation especially interested, but also throughout Lancaster Classis, and wheresoever men are interested in the early history of our Church in America. The consistory contemplates the publication of a second volume, containing a com-

plete record of baptisms, confirmations, marriages and deaths. Judging from our experience as pastor of the old historic Brush Creek Church in Westmoreland County, Pa., there are many of the descendants of those people who will gladly welcome such a book.

THOS. S. LAND, A.M.

PERSIA, THE LAND OF THE MAGI; OR THE HOME OF THE WISE MEN. A Description of Persia, its People, their Manners, Customs, Matrimony and Home Life, including Religion, Education and Literature, the King, his Court, and forms of punishment, etc. Illustrated. By Rev. S. K. Nroceya, M.D., of Urmia City, Persia. Price, \$1.10. Not sold in book stores, but to be had of the author at Indianapolis, Ind.

The author of this book is a Persian, whose father was a Presbyterian minister, connected with the medical missions of that Church in Persia. He has been in this country some ten years, presumably for the prosecution of his studies. He has evidently not been here long enough to get a very firm grip on the peculiarities of our English speech. The article and the relative clauses trouble him considerably when he has to use them. Besides that the proof reading has been very carelessly done. On the whole the book will prove a disappointment to those who expect to learn from its pages very much of Persia that is worth knowing. Those who are interested in the author or his work and who may desire to aid a worthy cause by the purchase of it, may be glad to know that such a book is to be had. There are some nice little Persian stories in it, sadly marred, however, in the telling of them. As for the rest, the title page gives a very fair idea of its contents.

THOS. S. LAND, A.M.

AN ORDER OF SERVICE WITH THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM, for use in the Family, the Sunday School, the Catechetical Class and Church Work Societies. New and enlarged edition. Compiled and arranged by Nathaniel Z. Snyder, D.D., South Bethlehem, Pa. Price, 40 cents.

Of making many editions of the Heidelberg Catechism, there is seemingly no end. This is another of the many attempts that have been made to adopt this, the queen of all the Reformation catechisms, to use in the different spheres of church activity. The editor has succeeded admirably, too, in his efforts. He has given us in this little book a veritable *multum in parvo*. Of its 233 pages, only 59 or about one-fourth of it is the Heidelberg Catechism. The greater part of the book is made up of devotional services for the different seasons of the Church year. It contains one hundred and twenty hymns and chants. There are also prayers for Sunday-schools, teachers' meetings, missionary services, society meetings, the catechetical class, the catechumen, table use, morning and evening devotions, and the sick and

afflicted. The Litany and the Te Deum find a place. We find also "Remarks on Confirmation"; "Advice to Catechumens"; "The History and Structure of the Catechism"; an "Outline of Church History" in questions and answers; an article on "Church Government" and directions for Scripture reading. Besides the gospel and epistle, and a psalm for each Sunday of the year, there is a course of Bible reading indicated, by which the Bible can be read through in a year. Even the first chapters of Chronicles and similar chapters in other books are included. Doubtless the whole Bible is inspired, but we wonder whether the ordinary Christian, in his devotional reading, finds such chapters as these very inspiring. They might well be omitted in such courses. Still the book deserves all commendation. The prayers are truly devotional, and we have no doubt that they who use the book in any of the ways in which it is intended to be used will find it very helpful.

THOS. S. LAND, A.M.